

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. XII, NO. 296

FEBRUARY 25, 1945

## *In this issue*

### INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

*Message of President Roosevelt, Addresses by President Avila Camacho and Secretary Stettinius*

### "BUILDING THE PEACE":

*What Is America's Foreign Policy?*

### COORDINATION OF CITEJA WITH THE NEW INTERNATIONAL CIVIL- AVIATION ORGANIZATIONS

*By Stephen Latchford*

### INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING: A FOUNDATION FOR THE PEACE

*By Dorothy Fosdick*

*For complete contents  
see inside cover*



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BULLETIN

VOL. XII • No. 296



PUBLICATION 2273

February 25, 1945

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Research and Publication, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.*

*Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.*

*The BULLETIN, published with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom all purchase orders, with accompanying remittance, should be sent. The subscription price is \$3.50 a year; a single copy is 10 cents.*

# Contents

## AFRICA

Visit of the Secretary of State to Liberia . . . . . 291

## AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace: Message From President Roosevelt to the President of the Conference . . . . . 273

Address by President Avila Camacho . . . . . 273

Address by Secretary of State Stettinius . . . . . 277

Renewal of Diplomatic Relations With El Salvador: Statement by Acting Secretary Grew . . . . . 304

## EUROPE

Bombings of Swiss Towns: Statement by Acting Secretary Grew . . . . . 309

Twenty-seventh Anniversary of the Red Army . . . . . 304

Relocation of Prisoner-of-War Camps in Germany . . . . . 314

## NEAR EAST

Death of the Prime Minister of Egypt . . . . . 304

## CULTURAL COOPERATION

Visit of Bolivian Educator . . . . . 315

Economist Accepts Visiting Professorship to Paraguay . . . . . 314

## ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Principles of Economic Policy: Address by William S. Culbertson . . . . . 299

International Cotton Advisory Committee: Announcement of Fourth Meeting . . . . . 301

## GENERAL

Report on the President's Trip Following the Crimea Conference . . . . . 280

## POST-WAR MATTERS

"Building the Peace". What Is America's Foreign Policy? . . . . . 282

International Understanding: A Foundation for the Peace. By Dorothy Fosdick . . . . . 295

Coordination of CITEJA With the New International Civil-Aviation Organizations. By Stephen Latchford . . . . . 310

## TREATY INFORMATION

Adherence by Venezuela to the Declaration by United Nations. Exchange of Communications . . . . . 292

Remarks by the Ambassador of Venezuela Upon Signing . . . . . 293

Remarks by Acting Secretary Grew . . . . . 294

Adherence by Uruguay to the Declaration by United Nations. Exchange of Communications . . . . . 294

United States-Mexican Water Treaty: Statement by Assistant Secretary Acheson . . . . . 302

Statement by Acting Secretary Grew . . . . . 303

## Civil Aviation

Civil Air-Transport Agreement Between Canada and the United States . . . . . 305

Agreement Between the United States and Canada Regarding Military Air-Transport Routes . . . . . 300

Signing of Military-Aviation-Mission Agreement With Guatemala . . . . . 309

(Continued on page 318)

MAR 13 '45

# Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

## Message From President Roosevelt to the President of the Conference<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press February 28]

His Excellency Licenciado EZEQUIEL PADILLA,<sup>2</sup>  
*President of the Inter-American Conference  
on Problems of War and Peace.*

The assembling of the Conference of the American Republics on Problems of War and Peace moves me to send cordial salutations to you and my felicitations to the Government and people of Mexico as hosts to this significant meeting. Will you please communicate to the delegates my greetings and confident anticipation of notable accomplishments.

Since the days of their independence the American republics have tirelessly explored every pathway to human freedom, justice, and international well being, and today the common men of all peace-loving nations look to them and you for light on the arduous road to world peace, security, and a higher level of economic life.

By their moral purpose, their intelligent efforts, and their friendly spirit they will make common cause among themselves and with other nations to attain the noblest objective of human aspiration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

## Address by President Avila Camacho<sup>3</sup>

[Released to the press February 21]

HONORABLE DELEGATES TO THIS CONFERENCE: In face of the violent spread of Nazism and Facism, the American governments, in 1942, through their delegates assembled at Rio de Janeiro, adopted military, economic, and political resolutions of grave importance. These resolutions were designed to coordinate and perfect the common defense of this continent, in order to preserve intact, together with destinies and the freedom of the Americas, the conception of a common life based on the fullest exercise of the rights belonging to man as a human being.

Since that conference, which we recall as clear-cut evidence of honor and solidarity, many of the republics represented on that occasion (Mexico among them) found it necessary, in order to maintain respect for their sovereignty, to accept the totalitarian challenge. They thus joined forces with those American nations that, prior to the Rio de Janeiro conference, had entered into an iniquitous war, which they did not provoke and which from the very outset they condemned, because true to their love of peace they could but abhor the dictatorial ambitions that had forced it upon them.

Before they took that determination, and likewise before the conference to which I have just referred, one of our countries had been the object

of a most treacherous and brutal act of aggression. Without warning, without an ultimatum, and at the very time when a special delegation feigned to be carrying on with the State Department at Washington diplomatic negotiations which were nothing but a monstrous artifice of refined hypocrisy, one of the powers of the anti-democratic Axis had flung itself upon the territory of one of the American nations, thus bringing the conflict within measurable distance of our hemisphere and making the conflagration world-wide.

In the presence of this outrage our continental consciousness was instantly aroused. A single thought galvanized all the nations: to fight if necessary, perhaps to perish, but never to tolerate the continuance, without punishment, of the cruel depredations committed by systems animated feverishly and sordidly for domination such as humanity had never seen.

In order to achieve this aim, what could some of our nations, weak from a military standpoint, whose industries were only incipient, and whose economy in so many ways was insignificant, contribute?

<sup>1</sup> Read at the plenary session of the Conference on Feb. 28, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Mexican Minister for Foreign Affairs.

<sup>3</sup> Delivered at the opening session of the Conference on Feb. 21, 1945 in the Chamber of Deputies at Mexico City.

A great deal, gentlemen; for it is not only material power that is engaged in this war. Over and above the forces of mere matter, the spirit throbs as a shining mentor. If the sword weighs heavily in the balance, still greater is the unchangeable power of virtue. And it is the virtue of the Americas which they have placed in the first rank of their offering on the altar of democracy: their innate honesty, their ardent idealism, the whole of their history, that intense history of theirs which is like a hymn etched by fire on the undying bronze of freedom.

Even though we had added nothing to that gift—the loftiest and purest of all—the tribute of our products, which are of such great use to the arsenals that supply the battlefields, even though the blood of so many of our men had not been shed, as it since has been, the moral help I am now praising would honor the whole of America at the moment of victory.

It is, therefore, with more than enough reason that we assemble to consider the problems that will be raised by the cessation of the war and the preparation of the future peace. Circumstances have so willed it that the conflict is throwing one more responsibility in our lives. The acceptance of this responsibility gives us the right, and imposes upon us the duty, of working out these problems by ourselves, of making our own suggestions, and of not allowing the cry of other unrest to drown the voice of America.

If I, as the President of Mexico, energetically express this conviction, it is because I think that the voice of America will be a splendid guaranty of perfect balance in the organization of the peace to come.

No one of us, of course, attempts to pose as a pattern and example to the others, for we all possess, as a valuable asset, the ability to remain calm when faced by decision of a multitude of disputes which others might wish to settle in accordance with interests and aspirations which we fortunately are far from seeking for ourselves. Our very youthfulness, which, it is true, deprives us of many of the elements of a decision, does place us beyond those passions and animosities which are the price that must be paid, on the other hand, by a number of nations for their antiquity and structural greatness.

If the international order of tomorrow were to be established by taking into account the opinion

of the powerful alone, in final analysis this war would prove to be nothing more than a gigantic and grotesque farce. But as we feel sure that this time our words will not be only words, for words that have cost so many millions of lives sooner or later take on the solidarity of unquestionable facts, we hopefully indulge in the thought of a common life worthy of the principles on whose behalf we have accepted the commitments imposed upon us by destiny, and we shall do our duty.

Our cause, fortunately, is not in conflict with that of anyone sincerely anxious for collective and indivisible security. More than a century ago, that superman Simón Bolívar proclaimed the advisability of continental assemblies like the present, "so that they might serve for counsel in major conflicts, as points of contact in time of common danger, as faithful interpreters of political treaties and conciliatory agencies in all controversies".

These four functions, as eloquently stated by the most universal genius of this hemisphere, are still those incumbent on conferences of this kind. In fact, in serious and widespread conflicts we must take counsel with one another, in order not to fritter away the effort of our unity. If understanding construction of treaties be lacking, their automatic and literal enforcement would, in practice, be the cause of unbearable oppression for the weak. Aside from this, differences between us should be settled in friendship, in good faith, and in a conciliatory spirit on the part of each and every one.

Among the common dangers that surround us, although it may properly be acknowledged that the immediate and direct risk of invasion by force of arms has steadily become less, due to the victories won by the United Nations, there are still two menaces: that demoralizing propaganda spread by totalitarian emissaries may seep in, and that peace will eventually be based on partial disregard of American needs and aspirations.

As regards the first of these two menaces, I am glad to express here and now my belief that our most positive defense will consist in loyally purifying, by means of republican institutions which we uphold, the ethical atmosphere in which that unshakable longing for democracy will have to develop. Since our peoples gained their independence it has exalted their deep thirst for equality, civic virtue, and true social justice.

These qualities of ours, if strengthened, will shield our existence more effectively than any bulwark. On the other hand, those faults of ours of which we may not be able to rid ourselves, like selfishness and discord, would expose us to the undermining agitation of those who though defeated in battle would attempt to bore from within and sabotage the peace on the soil of those very nations which during the war had never consented to expose themselves to the corrosive influence of their doctrines.

It therefore becomes urgent to purify the integral organization of democracy from within by training the new generations to fit them for liberty and by making every citizen of the Americas an active supporter of its independence.

In that era of equity and progress to which we aspire, it will be essential to safeguard all the peoples jointly against every form of aimless drifting begotten by neglect, by destitution, by ignorance, and by the lack of equal opportunity for decent and dignified living. As regards some of the public calamities summarized, the most effective insurance will be the vigor with which we protect, within our own boundaries and by means of our own legislative and cultural resources, the evolution of genuine democracy.

Facts have shown us that when a government is the faithful interpreter of the sovereign will of a nation, the masses are neither discouraged nor demoralized and are therefore not suitable material for the intricate machinations of those who seek to turn to account domestic unrest as pretexts for conflict abroad. Facts also teach us that no agreement can achieve solidarity among the members of any international association, when the governments of some of them (as happens in the case of dictatorships) live under the influence of a system actuated by violence, while the others are endeavoring to give true form to the aspirations of the majority of the community. If we apply the foregoing conclusions to the Americas, it is well to point out that, however numerous the geographical similarities, ethnical affinities, and historical development of the states of this hemisphere may be, our greatest capacity for persistence will rest upon the fervor with which we cultivate the ideal of democratic brotherhood, under the egis of which we are today gathering for discussion.

But it happens that, without the real support of a well-planned economic democracy, political

democracy is precarious, both in a nation and in an assembly of nations, whether universal or continental. That is why we Mexicans are deeply concerned, on this occasion of the celebration in our country of a conference inspired by the intention of contributing solid and concrete proposals to the peace of the world, with pointing out with unswerving rectitude that in our judgment peace can only be lasting if the United Nations build it upon indestructible moral and material foundations.

Men are men, wherever they may be born, wherever they may live, work, and die. To guarantee to all men, simply because they are men, without distinction as to race or place, an adequate minimum of fruitful opportunity for existence will be the essential requirement of every order aiming to be peaceful. Firm and just international cooperation will prevail only if there is a determination slow and unwavering to guarantee that irreducible minimum. But when I speak of cooperation, I am certainly not thinking of unilateral assistance, which in the long run is always impracticable for the strong and depressing and unhealthy for the weak. No. No method of simple beneficence can help nations in critical stages of their growth. On the contrary, we need an economic cooperation that shall by placing limits of justice on the spheres of activity of the most industrialized societies permit all of them to use their available resources to best advantage and that will likewise permit in the least a reasonable stimulus to more fully exploit its natural resources.

That cooperation could very likely fluctuate between methods of immediate financial assistance, by ways and means which would not foreshadow imperialistic investments, and cooperative procedures in such matters as markets and transportation; for it may be recalled that monopolies of trade and certain communications routes are among those that have caused most harm to good understanding among nations.

Even though this part of our activities were reduced to the construction of a coherent economy in this hemisphere, we may well find advantages in joining our plans and our methods for the good of other continents, since not even in times of closest union among themselves do our republics forget the postulates of a growing universality for the betterment and uplifting of all mankind.

There will be work for everyone, and therefore happiness, if men will stop encouraging the mis-

takes that made of the pre-war period a sordid struggle of trade incentives during which, in a crisis of abundance and unemployment, some regions perished and in others the people died of starvation.

Evidently, inter-American cooperation will not in itself alone suffice to bring about a state of affairs which, by its very complexity, calls for more general interlocking and demands the advent of an era of generous world conciliation. But the experience of America will facilitate that advent. We shall not prove ourselves equal to the loftiness of the hope that our hemisphere has held for the world since the day of its discovery, if we hesitate an instant in assuming the unavoidable responsibilities of transforming that wonderful hope into a living and magnificent reality.

The interdependence of legitimate interests, as a system, and the solidarity of ideals, as a standard of cohesion, will make it necessary for America to assist effectively in the work of reconstruction that will be demanded by the first period of the post-war world.

A free America, strong, healthy, prosperous, and enlightened, will constitute an inestimable promise of well-being for the civilized world. The conference which we are inaugurating today will be able to contribute to the determination of the American destiny along the lines of permanent human service. The delegates of 19 American republics are attending the ceremony that brings us together. Only two of them are not present at this time: Argentina and El Salvador, nations which hold a cordial place in our thoughts and in our affections.

Deploring their absence and hoping that circumstances will soon afford us the satisfaction of seeing them officially associated with our present efforts, as they have participated with such enthusiasm, I greet in the name of my country the representatives of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, United States, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, and Venezuela, and, upon extending to them the warmest welcome, I beg them to transmit to their governments the gratitude of Mexico for the friendship with which they have responded to our invitation.

Gentlemen: Mexico, which is greatly complimented at having been chosen as the scene of your

deliberations, reiterates to you, through me, its faith in the success of this conference and its ardent wishes for the happiness of the American nations.

War and peace will form the central topic of your assembly. No other more important topic has been offered to society since the most primitive peoples began to realize just what their conduct meant. War, with its cruelty and alarm, its slaughter, its calamities, and its ruin. Peace, with the work of its shops and its schools, with its furrows driven frequently in land by the enemy pick and shovel, plowed with shot and shell, and turned over by the defenders with pick and shovel when they dug their trenches. However, just as life and death are not isolated and solitary accidents, so must war and peace be analyzed as phenomena that explain one another and which unavoidably follow one another in a direct and pathetic relationship.

A peace guaranteed militarily, but illogical economically, unjust politically, and arbitrary according to the social standards of those dictating it, carried within itself the seed of future war. And a war that does not end entirely with the disappearance of the forces which unfortunately motivated it always leads to an incomplete, insecure, and false peace.

During recent months, we have spoken with persistence of the necessity of winning the peace. To win it, as is desired, it is imperative first to win the war: and not to win it for the benefit of this or that individual, limited, and regional interest; nor to win it for the triumph gained over the forces of which our adversaries boast; nor yet to win it for the moral triumph of the victors over themselves; in order that victory, when it is achieved, will be a total victory of mankind.

A victory such as this, truly human, will provide the occasion for inaugurating an era of effective harmony in this world. For these reasons, I end by declaring to you: May the will of America inspire you in order that you may emerge with a body of agreements and suggestions which will in matters concerning this continent be able to strengthen this situation of harmony, without which all the treaties imaginable, capable as we undoubtedly hope them to be, will remain at the mercy of new controversies. Gentlemen, in this task—so arduous but so noble—the most fervent wishes of my country accompany you.

## Address by Secretary of State Stettinius<sup>1</sup>

(Released to the press February 22)

**MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW DELEGATES:** It is an honor and a privilege for me to address on behalf of the Government of the United States this conference of American republics on the problems of war and peace. I bring to you the most cordial greetings of the President of the United States and of my great predecessor, Cordell Hull.

We have met here in beautiful and historic Mexico City because we—the peoples of the New World—are at an historic juncture in our own affairs and in our relationship to the rest of the world.

The vital interests of the American republics are equally involved in winning the war and in making the peace.

The United States Government looks upon this conference in Mexico City as a meeting of decisive importance. Our unity has been greatly strengthened by our wartime collaboration. Now it is our task to advance this unity still further both for the war and in our political, economic, and social collaboration in the tasks of peace.

I wish to reaffirm to the representatives of all the Governments assembled here that the United States Government regards the good-neighbor policy and the further development of inter-American cooperation as indispensable to the building, after victory, of a peaceful and democratic world order. I wish also to reaffirm the belief of the United States that this democratic order must be built by all nations, large and small, acting together as sovereign equals.

### II

I have just had an extraordinary experience that has driven home to me more sharply than ever before the significance of the fact that the world is now truly united in time and space.

A week ago I was in Moscow where I paid a brief visit after we had completed our work at the Crimea Conference. Moscow is over 15,000 miles away by the route I came. In the short time since I left Washington I have traveled 24,000 miles on the business of war and peace. I have flown over the North and South Atlantic Oceans and over points on five of the world's six continents—Europe, Asia, Africa, and North America, and South America. I have come from a conference

about war and peace conducted on the shores of the Black Sea to another conference about war and peace meeting ten days later in Mexico City.

Both are concerned with essentially the same problem. For they are no longer purely European problems of war and peace, or American problems of war and peace, or African, or Asian problems of this character. War anywhere in the world today threatens war throughout the world. Peace anywhere in the world today requires a whole world at peace. The prosperity and well-being and security of the peoples of the American continents is bound up with the prosperity and well-being and security of the other continents and islands of the earth.

For a long time we relied for protection upon the oceans which surround these continents. Now we know that there are no barriers of sea or air or land that can separate us from the rest of the world. We have learned our lesson in two successive world-wide conflagrations which have destroyed our sons, consumed our wealth, and interrupted our peaceful and creative purpose as disastrously almost as though their battles had been fought upon our prairies or in our cities.

And we are sure now what it is that must be done. It is not enough to stop war at our coasts—nor on the oceans that lie beyond our coasts. War must be stopped at the point, whatever point it may be on the surface of the earth, where war begins.

### III

Toward that end we worked at the Crimea Conference. Toward that end we are assembled here. May I, before I address myself directly to the tasks of this conference, say a few words about the meeting in the Crimea.

You have all read the communiqué of the Crimea Conference. You know that the unity of the three powers represented there was greatly strengthened, both for the war and for the peace.

A full measure of credit for this result belongs to the President of the United States, whose vision, courage, understanding, and creative purpose were never displayed to better advantage. I want also

<sup>1</sup> Delivered at the plenary session of the Conference on Feb. 22, 1945 in the Chamber of Deputies at Mexico City. The Secretary of State is the American Delegate to the Conference.

to pay tribute to the other two heads of Government, Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill, and to the Soviet and British Foreign Secretaries, Mr. Molotov and Mr. Eden, with whom I worked in such close, friendly, and effective collaboration at the conference. They have rendered distinguished service to the United Nations cause.

I reviewed the achievements of the Crimea Conference with the President of the United States when I met him again three days after we had left the Crimea. It is the President's firm conviction that the results of the Crimea Conference have greatly advanced the basic objectives of United States foreign policy.

My purpose tonight is to speak to you of our hopes of what may be accomplished here in Mexico City and of these basic objectives of our foreign policy.

#### IV

The earliest possible final defeat of the aggressors who plunged the world into war and so gravely threatened the security of this hemisphere is, I am sure, the first objective of the other American republics, as it is of the United States.

Military matters are, of course, not in my field, but it was generally agreed at the Crimea Conference that the military plans completed there in the closest cooperation by the Chiefs of Staff of the three powers—and the continuing three-power-staff meetings there provided for—will shorten the war and thus save the lives of tens of thousands of United Nations fighting men.

Here at Mexico City the American republics have met to consider what further steps we can take together to that same end—helping to shorten the war.

The solid foundations of the wartime collaboration of the American republics were laid at the conferences of Montevideo and Buenos Aires in 1933 and 1936 and at Lima in 1938. In meetings at Panama, Habana, and Rio de Janeiro after the outbreak of this war the intention and the capacity of our countries to implement our solidarity was fully demonstrated. We have acted together in accordance with the declaration of Habana that an act of aggression against any American state is an act of aggression against all of us.

The American republics since 1940 have succeeded together in building up the defenses of this

hemisphere to an extent never before dreamed of. Their military forces have cooperated in the war. They have increased greatly the military might of United States and other United Nations armed forces through their production of strategic materials that were transformed in our factories into the fleets of planes and tanks and ships which are carrying the war to the enemy.

The only hope that remains to the Nazi and the Japanese is that the United Nations might now relax their efforts in the belief that the war is as good as over. It is thus more important than ever before that we maintain and strengthen this active wartime collaboration of the American republics.

I have high confidence that our discussions here will result in cooperative action that will hasten the day of final victory.

#### V

The second major point I wish to make is this: I am certain that all of our countries will support as absolutely necessary to the future of the world and of this hemisphere the strong and sweeping policies toward Germany agreed upon at the Crimea Conference. This is what was agreed upon:

"We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans; wipe out the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organizations and institutions, remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public office and from the cultural and economic life of the German people; and take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to the future peace and safety of the world. It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when Nazism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans, and a place for them in the comity of nations."<sup>1</sup>

So far as the United States is concerned, this is a fundamental of our foreign policy. The world may rest assured that the United States, in full

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 18, 1945, p. 214.

agreement with our Allies, is inflexibly resolved upon whatever steps may be necessary to insure that neither Germany nor Japan will ever again have the military or industrial capacity to make war.

We of the Americas have another responsibility to fulfil in the destruction of Nazi-Fascism—a responsibility common to all of us. During the war we have through close cooperation achieved encouraging success in combating Axis economic and political penetration and in preventing Nazi and Fascist sabotage. But we have much yet to do. We still face the danger of secret Nazi-Fascist infiltration into the political and economic life of this hemisphere.

The Axis leaders will, of course, attempt to escape the consequences of their crimes. We must be constantly on the alert for the flight to this hemisphere of Nazi funds and Nazi underground leaders who will seek to find a refuge here that can serve as a base for an ultimate come-back.

The people of the United States are confident that the American republics will join in whatever cooperative measures may be necessary to stamp out utterly every vestige of Nazi influence in this hemisphere. That must be our unalterable purpose.

## VI

At the Crimea Conference the Soviet Union and Great Britain joined the United States in a Declaration on Liberated Europe. This declaration provides for joint action by the three Governments to assist the liberated peoples during the temporary period of instability in Europe "to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

The three powers thus pledged joint action to uphold the right proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations.

This is a third fundamental purpose of United States foreign policy. We intend to make our full contribution toward the building of a world in which the right of every nation to develop free institutions according to its own desires will be upheld. We look upon this purpose as part of

the American faith which we have sought to practice in our relations with other peoples.

The United States will not shirk its responsibilities in seeing to it, so far as it is within our power, that this purpose is achieved.

The Declaration of Liberated Europe adopted at the Crimea Conference is animated by much the same spirit and purpose as the good-neighbor policy. We recognize that all nations are interdependent and that no nation can achieve peace and prosperity alone. We believe that all nations are equal before the law and that the equal rights of all nations, large and small, must be upheld.

## VII

We are assembled here to discuss the creation at the earliest possible moment—and before the end of the war—of an international organization to insure the peace of the world, by force if necessary. This is a fourth major objective of United States foreign policy, as I am sure it is of the other American republics.

Largely because of the vision and leadership of Cordell Hull, we were able to lay the foundations last fall at Dumbarton Oaks. These Proposals setting forth a plan for such an organization were agreed upon by the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China. Since then these Proposals have been studied and discussed throughout the world.

At the Crimea Conference the last obstacle to calling a United Nations conference to adopt the Charter for such a world organization was removed. The Soviet Union and Great Britain there agreed to the Proposals presented by the President of the United States for voting procedure in the Security Council.

The United Nations conference, toward which we have been constantly striving, has therefore been called to meet at San Francisco, California, on April 25, 1945, just nine weeks from now. Invitations will be issued as soon as we have completed our consultations with China and France, who have been invited to join in sponsoring the conference.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals recognize that the world Organization has two tasks: *first*, to prevent aggression; and *second*, to reduce and remove the causes of war through close political,

economic, and social collaboration among all peace-loving peoples.

The Proposals are designed to prevent lawless power politics and to use the power of the great nations in the interests of the peace and freedom of *all* nations. They are based squarely upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the United Nations Declaration, and they draw heavily upon the ideals and practices of the inter-American system, to which the statesmen of the American republics here present have contributed so much.

The agreement reached on voting procedure at the Crimea Conference recognizes the two essential elements of a successful world organization—unity of action by the great powers who alone have the military and industrial strength to prevent aggression; and the equal sovereignty of all nations, large and small, who must act together to create the essential conditions of lasting peace.

We have met here in order to carry further our discussions of the world Organization before the United Nations conference at San Francisco. We will not, of course, in this inter-American meeting take decisions on questions of policy that will be explored by all the United Nations together at San Francisco.

However, we should, I believe, examine what steps need to be taken to strengthen the inter-American system for the major role which it should play in the world of the future.

Let me remind you that the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals recognize the value, within the framework of a general organization, of regional arrangements for promoting peace and security.

The United States Government believes that the stronger we can make the inter-American system in its own sphere of activity the stronger the world Organization will be.

### VIII

There is another statement of purpose in the Atlantic Charter which was reaffirmed at the Crimea Conference—the purpose to build a peace "which will . . . afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want".

I can assure you that the United States does not regard this as a rhetorical assertion of vague in-

tentions. We regard it as a *necessity* if the United Nations are to build a peace that will endure.

We cannot, of course, accomplish this purpose overnight. We can accomplish it only by establishing the world Organization and by continuing an ever-closer collaboration among the nations of this hemisphere and among all nations toward a rising standard of living and wider opportunities for all men and women, regardless of race, creed, or color.

The United Nations, which have fought so successfully together against the Axis in this war, must join together in the years after victory in waging war with equal vigor and unity against hunger, poverty, ignorance, and disease. The accomplishment of this purpose is the fifth of the fundamental objectives of United States foreign policy to which I have referred tonight.

Consideration of the practical steps that we can take together toward this end is part of the business of this conference, as it was in the Crimea and as it will be at San Francisco.

Here in Mexico City we are particularly concerned with the application of this policy in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States intends to propose and support measures for closer cooperation among us in public health, nutrition, and food supply, labor, education, science, freedom of information, transportation, and in economic development, including industrialization and the modernization of agriculture.

We are also faced with the immediate necessity of preparing to meet the many problems of transition from our wartime economic collaboration to the methods of peacetime collaboration.

It is the fixed purpose of the United States Government to undertake, in cooperation with the other American republics, to reduce to the minimum the inevitable dislocations of this transition period.

Adjustments will be required in the production of some strategic commodities, the output of which has been stimulated greatly by the common war effort. My Government hopes that a program can be agreed upon by the nations here represented which will provide a basis for accomplishing this adjustment in such a way as to protect the economies of the American republics.

The war has placed many restrictive controls upon normal trade. During the transition period,

which will begin after the defeat of Germany, we should relax these artificial wartime restrictions as rapidly as our primary objective of winning the war makes possible.

We must seek also positive measures to promote constantly rising levels of international trade among the nations of this hemisphere and among all nations—much higher than we ever enjoyed before.

Economically sound industrial development and the modernization of agriculture are essential to sustain these higher levels of trade and to fuller employment and rising standards of living.

This requires arrangements to assure reasonably stable rates of exchange and to promote international investment in profitable new enterprises which will increase the productive capacity of the countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as in other parts of the world.

We should take the necessary international action at the earliest possible moment. Supplementary measures of various kinds are also required on a national level to encourage foreign investment. In our country we propose to extend our operations in this field, making full use of the facilities available including the Export-Import Bank.

By collaborating in these economic and financial measures and combining them with our programs of mutual technical assistance in industry, agriculture, labor, cultural relations, public health, nutrition, and their related fields, we can achieve together the rising standard of living that we all seek.

## IX

The nations of the world today are face to face with a historic crisis and a historic opportunity—an opportunity greater than any offered to all the generations of men who have preceded us.

We of this generation for the first time have it truly within our power to build a lasting peace and to build it in such a manner that a new world of freedom and opportunity for all men can actually be realized within the foreseeable future.

The achievement of these tasks is the joint responsibility of all peace-loving nations, large and small. A special obligation also rests with the great powers which are carrying the main burden of the war. Effective and continuing collaboration among themselves and with other peace-lov-

ing nations is essential both to victory and to peace. That sacred obligation was recognized and met at the Crimea Conference.

It is equally true that neither victory nor peace can be won without the full support of the American republics and without effective and continuing collaboration among themselves and with the rest of the world. That sacred obligation we must recognize and meet here at Mexico City.

We know that without the contributions that have been made by the American republics in the war the United Nations could not defeat the Axis aggressors.

This American strength—this strength of the New World—must also be built into the structure of peace if that structure is to endure.

I am thinking not only of the factories and farms and mines and forests—of all the developed and still-undeveloped wealth of these western continents.

I am thinking not only of the power and the will of our nations to use this wealth for the good of all the people.

I am thinking also of those beliefs for which *Americans* of all our countries have lived and fought—beliefs that form for our peoples an unbreakable core of unity.

We believe in the essential worth and integrity and equal rights of the individuals and of individual nations, large and small.

We believe in the people and therefore in the right of the people to govern themselves in accordance with their own customs and desires.

We believe in peace, not war, and we have sought to practice peace, not war, in our dealings with each other and with countries in other parts of the world.

Let us recognize that this hour of our greatest opportunity is also an hour of danger and difficulty. We can as easily lose this opportunity as we can seize and use it. This is partly because our old enemies, aggression and tyranny, are now able to use for the corruption and oppression of the minds of men the very science that we seek to use for the enlightenment and freedom of men. So long as Nazi-Fascism exists anywhere in the world—or if it is ever permitted through disunity or indifference on our part to reestablish itself anywhere in the world—our peace and freedom are endangered.

(Continued on page 313)

## ‘Building the Peace’

# What Is America’s Foreign Policy?

[Released to the press February 24]

VOICE No. 1: Just what is America’s foreign policy?

VOICE No. 2: What I want to know is, do we *have* a foreign policy?

VOICE No. 3: What does all this have to do with *me*, anyhow?

ANNOUNCER: (*Pause*) Good questions, all of them, and the answers are *important*, and vitally concern *you*. We’ll deal with them in this, the first in a new series of programs on our foreign policy, arranged by the NBC University of the Air. This evening, and for the next six programs in this series, we will present top officials of our State Department, who will talk about the problems of *Building the Peace*. The Secretary of State—Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.—will introduce this evening’s program from Mexico City. Immediately following, Assistant Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and Archibald MacLeish will discuss American foreign policy, with special reference to the Crimea Conference, answering many questions of importance to your future and mine. Now to Mexico City and Secretary of State Stettinius. Come in, Mr. Stettinius.<sup>2</sup>

STETTINIUS: It is particularly appropriate that a series of broadcasts on the building of the peace should be opened from a conference of American nations in Mexico City. This conference propitiously follows the meeting in the Crimea which revealed the broad pattern of aims and purposes of the nations associated in the war and precedes the United Nations meeting to be held in San Francisco.

<sup>1</sup> This program broadcast over the National Broadcasting Company on Feb. 24, 1945 is the first of a series of seven broadcasts to be sponsored by the Department of State.

<sup>2</sup> Owing to technical communication difficulties between Washington and Mexico City, the speech of the Secretary of State was read from Washington by Assistant Secretary MacLeish.

### PARTICIPANTS

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.  
Secretary of State

DEAN ACHESON  
Assistant Secretary of State

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH  
Assistant Secretary of State

KENNEDY LUDLAM  
Announcer for NBC

We Americans of all the American republics have lived our lives—have lived our histories—in the discovery and the building of new worlds.

We know that worlds can be discovered such as men in older continents had never imagined. We know that worlds can be built such as men in other ages had never seen. We are not frightened, therefore, or discouraged, or

dismayed when we are brought face to face with the necessity of creating something new—an effective world organization.

Delegates from the American republics are assembled in this beautiful city of Mexico to strengthen the fraternal ties developed through many decades, and to improve the inter-American system of relations.

They are engaged in the serious business of considering how their friendship and unity of purpose may best contribute to a world organization for peace, security, and a better way of life. This meeting affords a forum where the ideas and opinions of the American republics may be given expression.

Already we have offered to the conference resolutions intended to accomplish the more effective cooperation of the American republics within the proposed new world structure.

Our entire American past is a past of bold explorations, of hardy settlement, of arduous construction, of difficult beginnings. We are accustomed to labors without precedent. We are hardened to the seeming impossible. We know how to do what was never done before. We have brought a vast and untamed continent to human order within a space of time which would seem impossible to those who measure what can be done in the future by what has been done before. In the Americas we have sought to foster a spirit of neighborliness,

which is indispensable to a new society of mankind.

We have good reason, therefore, for approaching the greatest labor of human history with such high hopes, with such unshakable determination. We have not listened in the past, and we will not listen in the future, to voices of frustration and defeat which tell us that we cannot do what we believe we must do. There is nothing in our American history that needed doing which did not find the men to do it.

But this labor of the construction of a peaceful world is not a labor to be spoken of in terms of hope and purposes only. Much has already been accomplished. Four nations have agreed among themselves on proposals for the organization of a peaceful world, and those proposals had been submitted to the people of the earth for their consideration. Never before has a proposal worked out by specialists and experts and agreed upon by representatives of several nations been submitted to such searching examination by the peoples of the world before its submission to a formal conference.

At the San Francisco conference, all of the United Nations will take part in setting up the permanent machinery for international security. They will participate as independent sovereign states. Sovereign equality of nations, large and small, is a basic principle underlying the Proposals.

Those Proposals not only embrace the sovereign equality of nations, but they also intend that the power of all nations shall be used in the interests of world peace, security, and freedom. Only on such a foundation may we realize the aspiration of mankind for a new and better world, with greater opportunity and well-being for all people.

The fact that the nations which took part in the primary discussions at Dumbarton Oaks were the nations which now bear, and have borne, the principal burden of the war makes it natural, and indeed inevitable, that Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States, and China should have taken primary responsibility for the initiation of these Proposals, as they have been obliged to take primary responsibility for the prosecution of the war.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, however, were incomplete. They had to be supplemented in several important respects. This was one of the great accomplishments of the Crimea Conference.

The voting procedure agreed upon at the Crimea Conference is a procedure, as I stated to the inter-American conference two days ago, which recognizes "the two essential elements of a successful world organization—unity of action by the great powers who alone have the military and industrial strength to prevent aggression; and the equal sovereignty of all nations, large and small, who must act together to create the essential conditions of lasting peace".

Once the world Organization is established and measures for social and economic welfare are undertaken, the true democracy of the Organization of the world for peace will become apparent.

It is to put before the people of the United States the facts about the proposed world Organization that the Department of State has undertaken this series of broadcasts. I like to think that our people for the next few weeks will study, discuss, and reflect on these Proposals which are so significant to the destiny of all mankind. It is my belief, and the belief of my colleagues in the Department, that our duty in this regard is to put the facts before the country, and let the facts speak for themselves. This is the democratic method. It is the only method that will be acceptable to our people.

Here in Mexico City we have sought to support that democratic method by offering a resolution which declares the right of peoples to have free access to information. In this way, and only in this way, will truth, the enemy of tyranny, assert itself for the freedom and security of mankind.

**ANNOUNCER:** This is NBC in Washington. This is the first of a new series of programs on "Our Foreign Policy", arranged by NBC's University of the Air. (*pause*) "What is America's foreign policy?" A lot of people have expressed ideas on this subject, but for an authoritative answer, NBC's University of the Air calls on the Department of State. Now—Assistant Secretaries of State Archibald MacLeish and Dean Acheson.

**MACLEISH:** This is Archibald MacLeish. The primary purpose of this program is to provide answers to questions. The Department of State receives a great many questions every day. Some of them come in by letter to the Department. Some are asked in newspaper editorials, or by radio commentators. Some come out of public

meetings. Most of them are questions which can and should be answered. The Department of State, believing that a foreign policy is only as good as the people's support of it, and therefore the people's understanding of it, is very happy indeed to accept the offer of the National Broadcasting Company to put the principal officers of the Department on the air where they can speak to anyone who cares to listen. We will make no attempt to dramatize or dress up this program in any way. The people who speak to you will be the responsible officers of the Department, and what they say will be precisely what they think. My job will be to put the questions—making myself for that purpose what you might call, if not a public prosecutor, at least a public interrogator. The questions with which we will begin are questions now before us for answer in one form or another. As this series goes on, there will undoubtedly be questions asked from the floor—from the radio audience—from Americans at home and overseas—and these, too, we will attempt to answer, in so far as they can be answered in as large and open a meeting as this.

This evening, I have Dean Acheson here at the microphone. Dean Acheson is the senior Assistant Secretary, having served in the Department now for four years. At one time he was Under Secretary of the Treasury. I'd like to begin with a question that goes to the heart of the Department's work—its reason for existence: A question we are sometimes asked with a certain inflection in the public prints. The question is, "Have we *got* a foreign policy?" That is a question you must have been thinking about off and on these last five years, Dean. What do you say to it?

ACHESON: Well, I suppose what you mean by that question is what a man means when he asks: "Do we know where we're going from here and how to get there?" One thing we all know: We don't like it where we are.

MACLEISH: In the midst of a tough war, you mean?

ACHESON: All wars are tough—this one was touch and go for quite a while. And though we know we are going to win it now, we still have the hardest fighting ahead. Anyway, we know we don't like it where we are, and we don't want to be in the same spot again. But what you have to remember when you think about all this in terms

of foreign policy is that we have been in this particular spot quite a few times before.

MACLEISH: You mean, we've been at war before?

ACHESON: I mean we have been in wars before which were started by other people. If you take a good look at our history, you will find that we have been in this particular spot almost every time a major war has started. We have been right in the middle of it. You name any really big war that has gone on in this world for 200 years and see if we haven't been in it.

MACLEISH: That would seem to add up to quite an indictment of our foreign policy.

ACHESON: Not at all. It is merely to state one of the facts of life. Great wars always have and always must involve us, because one side or the other wants to do something which affects us. When the European powers fought during our early history they wanted to conquer portions of this continent. In the last two world wars the aggressor nations wanted to deal with the other free nations first and then issue their orders to us, but they couldn't wait to finish the others before attacking us.

MACLEISH: What do you say those facts of life mean in terms of foreign policy?

ACHESON: Well, first, there's the fact that we have some 50 independent nations on this globe, each with different traditions, interests, and resources. Each of these nations, regardless of its size and power, is a sovereign nation. Another important fact of international life is that we in the United States live not on the far edge, but right smack in the middle, of this community of some 50 independent nations—and therefore what they do affects us.

MACLEISH: That sounds pretty simple and elementary.

ACHESON: And so it is. But unless I am entirely mistaken it is the bedrock explanation of why American foreign policy has got to be directed in one of two ways: either toward organized international cooperation, or toward aggressive imperialistic militarism.

MACLEISH: Would you mind explaining that in more detail?

ACHESON: Well, what I mean is this: We don't want to go through life as a nation or as individuals always living either in the middle of or on the edge of a brawl. And if you have some 50

nations who are laws unto themselves there are broadly two choices: either try to organize the community to get order by agreement, or become strong enough yourself to *impose* your particular brand of order by force on others. The Romans, earlier, and the Germans and Japanese, more recently, have tried the second choice. It doesn't seem to have worked for them, and I am certain we would be even worse at it simply because we haven't been bred to it as individuals or as a nation. But up to recent years, I don't believe we as a nation faced up to the fact that, this being a world of alternatives, our alternative was to base our foreign policy on organized international cooperation.

MACLEISH: What do you mean by a foreign policy based upon organized international cooperation?

ACHESON: Like anything else it's best defined in terms of what it means in action. In practice it means reaching agreement with other nations. I guess that's the literal meaning of "cooperation"—doing things together. And those "things" range anywhere from settling a border problem with one other neighboring nation to such things as the projected collective action of all the United Nations at the San Francisco conference in April in establishing an organization to maintain peace. We must not fool ourselves; there's nothing easy about a foreign policy of organized international cooperation. It is usually a torturously difficult process, but in very plain language it's our best bet.

MACLEISH: I think most of us realize by now that we've got to have such a policy, that we can't stay on the sidelines and depend on blindfold and fancy devices to keep us out of wars.

ACHESON: Yes, we know now that neutrality acts, and cash-and-carry acts, and Johnson acts won't save us from wars that break out in other parts of the earth. We can't keep out of these wars because each one of them, if it is allowed to go on, sooner or later comes to us. Somebody wants to do something to us—such as drawing our teeth so that we can't be a factor in the war. Or he may want what we have. Or he may not like our ideas and our institutions. Anyhow, in the end, as history has proved to us now, every first-class war sooner or later comes to us. We can't keep out of it—at least we can't keep out of it and be the kind of people we are.

MACLEISH: That adds up to saying that our foreign policy has a good deal to do with the kind of people we are.

ACHESON: Obviously. For example, we in this country are a lot of inveterate individualists. We want to be ourselves. We don't want other people bossing us around. We are energetic people. We like to do things. We like to go around digging in the ground and seeing the results of our work. We are busy people. We like to see things happen. But, most of all, we are individualists. And for that reason, we love freedom—freedom to be ourselves. Maybe we could accomplish a lot more if we organized ourselves like ants. But we'd rather be free. That is the way we are and that is the way we will stay.

MACLEISH: And being that sort of people, we have a passionate attachment to certain beliefs—beliefs such as fair play and democracy. What people *believe* in makes them what they *are*. The Nazis and some Americans, too, like to say that we don't know what we're fighting for. Well, it is true that we don't have a neat, well-packaged, universally accepted set of national objectives. Only under a tyranny do you have that kind of unanimous agreement, and then it's only on the surface. But we do know what we believe in. Our strength as a nation lies in that fact. And our enemies have had an opportunity to discover what that strength amounts to.

ACHESON: Yes, we've managed to outfight them, and outgeneral them, and outlast them. That has been quite a surprise to the Nazis and the Japanese militarists who were so contemptuous of us a few years ago.

MACLEISH: What they don't understand, what they will never understand, is the strength of the basic American belief in the people. The idea of the people—of the dignity and responsibility of the people—is the idea we pioneered in the days of the American Revolution and have never forgotten. That revolutionary idea has never been stronger than it is today, for it has proved itself today in the ultimate test of battle. The Fascists and the Nazis put it in issue, and the issue has been decided, is being decided—against the Fascists and the Nazis and the rest of the pretenders.

ACHESON: I'm going to be a little less philosophical, if you don't mind, and more specific. I'd rather get down to cases. We don't think there is

anything in big people kicking the stuffing out of little people—therefore we are all for the under-dog. The American is always for him. When people get kicked around, we don't like it. We are against all sorts of strong-arm tactics. We don't think brutality is the sign of greatness. We want a world that is free from bullies going around and beating people up and taking things away from them, or making them do what they don't want to do. And we want a world that is open to a busy, energetic life. Our foreign policy is to make that kind of a world.

MACLEISH: So we have a foreign policy?

ACHESON: Obviously.

MACLEISH: And I take it you think our foreign policy is related to the opinions of our people. Let's get down to cases on that too. The people clearly disapproved of Japan's aggression in Manchuria and Italy's in Ethiopia, and Italy's and Germany's in Spain. Did our foreign policy also disapprove?

ACHESON: The people may have disapproved but they didn't really think that these things affected them. The people as a whole didn't realize the danger that confronted us until 1939—or, rather, until the fall of France in 1940. When we saw the Germans overrunning western Europe, we were ready to start helping Britain and the democracies, even at the risk of getting into the war ourselves. We slowly began to realize we'd have to fight alone, sooner or later, if we didn't help to save our friends and potential allies. Now we are in it, and our main thought is to get it over and keep it from happening again.

MACLEISH: How much difference is there between foreign policy and domestic policy from the point of view of public opinion? Do you think that foreign policy lags behind public opinion more than domestic policy?

ACHESON: I think there is no difference. Foreign policy is not a thing apart. Foreign policy in a democracy is merely the expression of the people's purpose with reference to matters outside the nation, whereas domestic policy is concerned with matters inside the nation. Both kinds of policy must reflect the nation's purpose. The basic policy of this nation at home and abroad is to keep the way open for our kind of life—the life of free men and women working out their own salvation and respecting the right of other people to do the same.

MACLEISH: You might say that American policy, foreign as well as domestic, is to keep the future open—to keep *our* kind of future open.

ACHESON: Sounds a little poetic to me.

MACLEISH: That doesn't necessarily mean it isn't true.

ACHESON: I'd like to approach it from another angle—what a foreign policy is *not*! I think it might clear up some confusion to do that. For one thing, our foreign policy is *not* cloak-and-dagger diplomacy. Foreign policy may—ought to—reflect self-interest, national interest, but it is not a device to enable us to put it over on the other fellow. A lot of people who upbraid us these days for not having a strong foreign policy are really upbraiding us for not slapping our Allies across the face. Some of them seem to think that, unless you quarrel with your friends, you don't have a mind of your own.

MACLEISH: I would guess that another thing that a foreign policy is *not* is a file system of plans for every contingency. You can't push a button or look in a card file under "A" and find the answers to all the questions on Afghanistan, Albania, and Australia. Foreign policy, as the word policy indicates, is really a set of general objectives. How you obtain those objectives depends on the situation at a given place and time.

ACHESON: And we might name a few specific policies which have been our main objectives at certain times and places—the Monroe Doctrine; the good-neighbor policy; the open door in China; lend-lease to our Allies in this war; Dumbarton Oaks.

MACLEISH: You said at the beginning, Dean, that the real question of foreign policy is "Where do we go from here, and how do we get where we want to go?" Well, how *do* we get where we want to go from where we are? We know we want peace. We know we want security. We know we want a sort of international freedom of opportunity. How do we get them?

ACHESON: The great majority of Americans want to join as soon as possible a world organization to preserve the peace.

MACLEISH: I'd say that that objective was reflected in the decisions of the Crimea Conference, wouldn't you?

ACHESON: Yes, the results of that Conference were in complete harmony with American opinion. That explains why the Conference was so widely

acclaimed. The Conference declaration showed that we and our Allies can get together on controversial issues. It showed that if we place unity first we can reach a compromise with some concessions from each side. And I think there was a great feeling of relief that our plans for post-war world organization will go forward while the war is still on. That's very important—to get things settled now, so that trouble won't begin to develop among the Allies.

MACLEISH: What in your opinion was the most important feature of the Yalta agreement?

ACHESON: From a long-range viewpoint, I should say the completion of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals by agreement on voting procedures in the proposed Security Council, and the agreement on the treatment of Germany. These are powerful factors in the building of an enduring peace. But for the immediate future, the decision on the Polish question was a great achievement. It will help a lot in settling this important question.

MACLEISH: Some writers have taken exception to the terms of the Polish decision. To read them you'd think Poland had been sold down the river.

ACHESON: I don't think that's typical of more than a small minority. Most of the press comment I've seen is to the effect that it's a very fair arrangement. The Crimea Conference came to an agreement that the eastern frontier of Poland should be based upon the Curzon Line.

MACLEISH: Yes, and it was more or less an accident of history that this was not the boundary of Poland after World War I. In 1919, at the Versailles conference, Allied representatives, including American representatives, felt that a Polish frontier, based generally on the Curzon Line, would be desirable. They found that to the east of this Line the population was predominantly Russian and Ukrainian, while to the west of it the population was predominantly Polish.

ACHESON: That's right, and today the Curzon Line generally represents the same division of peoples. Moreover, such variation as there may be from the Curzon Line under the Crimean agreement will favor the Poles. The Crimean agreement also provides that the new Polish Government will include Polish patriots outside the country, and this is to be done by a commission in which the Soviet Union will have one representative, Foreign Minister Molotov—and the United States and Britain one each—our Ambassadors to Moscow. Second, the new provisional

government will hold free elections with a secret ballot and universal suffrage. That also looks like a fair and reasonable arrangement.

MACLEISH: What about Greece? The Greek situation has also been a storm center. We've had plenty of mail about that.

ACHESON: Fortunately, that issue seems well on the way to being solved. The fighting has stopped over there. There is no question about the right of the Greeks to govern themselves and to hold free elections. Under the Yalta agreement, the three major powers will consult, if necessary, and joint action will be taken to guarantee democratic rights to the Greeks. The same applies to every liberated country, for the period of the transition to peace.

MACLEISH: And the terms for Germany?

ACHESON: The people who are most *unhappy* about the Crimea Conference are the Germans. They don't like the results because their last chance of splitting the Allies away from each other is gone. The game is up. The military leaders of our three countries will coordinate their final offensives more closely than ever, and we have served notice that not only Nazism, but the whole German military system, goes on the scrapheap. There's no misunderstanding that! No wonder the German leaders are worked up about it.

MACLEISH: The important thing is that at last we're going to take our full share of responsibility in building the peace, everywhere in the world. A small minority may call this "meddling"; but I think this policy will be generally approved, because the Americans believe in standing by their principles.

ACHESON: It will be a good guaranty that we are not fighting this war for nothing.

MACLEISH: But there is one more thing that I think should be emphasized here: Permanent peace is more than a matter of political organization. It's more than a matter of economic prosperity. It's also a matter of ideals—moral and spiritual values—without which we cannot have true peace. The ultimate sanction of an effective world organization, after all, will be the faith we—the United Nations—have in each other's moral sincerity.

ACHESON: But look here, Archie, you've been asking all the questions. Let *me* ask *you* one: What do *you* think is the most important thing about the Crimea Conference declaration?

MACLEISH: To me the most satisfying thing is the fact that we are now at last well on the road

to a permanent international organization. This time we're not waiting for a peace conference to set up the machinery. We made that mistake last time. We tried to run the war and the peace last time in two sections, and it didn't work. This time we're acting at the high tide of victory. We are determined to carry it through to success. That's the best insurance I know against World War III.

ACHESON: It all comes back to this: A country's foreign policy, like its domestic policy, stems from its national interests. The things we want most are peace from now on, and to see democracy grow in the world, and a chance to get around and see things and build things, here and abroad. That explains why the Crimea Conference report was so well received. It is obviously in line with our objectives and takes us a long way toward peace and security. Most people sense this, I think, and so they are happy about it.

MACLEISH: We started with the question: "Have we *got* a foreign policy?" I'd like to try to see whether we have arrived at an answer.

ACHESON: Go ahead.

MACLEISH: Well, your first reply, as I understood it, was that any nation, living as we do in the midst of some 50 different and independent nations, has two choices if it wishes an orderly world—to impose its brand of order on the world by force or to try to get the world to organize itself by agreement. As between these two alternatives, you thought the only workable choice for us was the second.

ACHESON: Right. We will either get order by organized international cooperation, or we won't get it.

MACLEISH: All right. And you concluded that we do have a foreign policy so far as this choice is concerned—that it is our policy to try to bring about the necessary international organization.

ACHESON: Yes. We have learned that we can't get by with substitutes and devices such as we tried in the years between the wars.

MACLEISH: But you felt, as I understood you, that our foreign policy was something more than a necessary choice between two alternatives—that it was positive also—that it reflected the kind of people we are.

ACHESON: That's right. Our foreign policy is to make the kind of world our kind of people *can* live in and want to live in—people who like to be

themselves and to be free and to get around and to build, to accomplish things.

MACLEISH: Then you made another point. You thought foreign policy and domestic policy were the same thing, as far as their relation to public opinion was concerned—that both kinds of policy must reflect the nation's purpose.

ACHESON: And we agreed that the Crimea Conference is a good example of foreign policy reflecting national purpose.

MACLEISH: We did. The Yalta communiqué reads like an answer to the questions which have been bothering the people most: what to do with Germany—how to pave the way for democratic governments in Poland, Greece, and other liberated countries.

ACHESON: You have forgotten the best news of all—that the British, the Russians, and ourselves agreed on the answer to the most difficult question left open at Dumbarton Oaks—the question of voting procedure.

MACLEISH: At the risk of seeming to philosophize again, I'd sum it all up by saying that we agree we have a foreign policy, that it is a foreign policy that works, and that the fundamental purpose is to keep the way open for the democratic future in which this Nation believes.

Next week, in the second of these programs, I'll have with me at the microphone Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew, and probably Alger Hiss, who was secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks conference and who recently returned from the Crimea Conference. We will talk about *Main Street and Dumbarton Oaks*. We'll delve a little deeper into our peace plans and proposals, then. Until next week, good-by.

ANNOUNCER: That was Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public and Cultural Relations. With him was Assistant Secretary Dean Acheson, who is in charge of congressional relations and international conferences.

This was the first of a series of programs on our foreign policy, arranged by NBC's University of the Air, both for listeners at home and for service men and women overseas, to be transmitted to them, wherever they are stationed, through the Armed Forces Radio Services. Six more programs will feature top officials of the Department of State, on the following subjects:

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals,  
World Trade and World Peace,  
What About the Liberated Areas?

**What About the Enemy Countries?  
Our Good Neighbors in Latin America, and  
The State Department Itself.**

Questions are invited on any or all of these subjects. Just send them to the State Department in Washington and we'll get as many answers for you as we can.

A pamphlet containing all of the seven broadcasts of this series in which State Department officials are participating will be supplied to you upon request. You should address your request to the Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. Separate copies of this evening's program alone are also available upon request.

Next Saturday at the same time you will hear a program entitled *Main Street and Dumbarton Oaks*. Archibald MacLeish will be back, this time with Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and

Alger Hiss, Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs of the State Department. Be sure to be on hand when they answer such questions as these:

VOICE No. 1: What has all this talk about Dumbarton Oaks got to do with me?

VOICE No. 2: How can you expect any world organization to work with so much power politics going on?

VOICE No. 3: What about the small nations: Where do they come in?

**ANNOUNCER:** These are questions we've got to answer. For we all have a part to play in *Building the Peace*. Yes—the war is still to be won—and we're winning it—but this time we must win the peace too!

Until next week at the same time, then. This is NBC in Washington.

## Report on the President's Trip Following the Crimea Conference

[Released to the press by the White House February 20]

The President with members of his immediate party left Livadia in the afternoon motoring over mountain roads along the Black Sea to Sevastopol where they spent the night aboard a United States Navy auxiliary ship. The route took the party over a battlefield nearly a century old where the historic Light Brigade made its famous charge in the Crimean War of 1854-56. For many miles the roadway led through territory bitterly contested by Russian and German armies in the recent Crimean campaigns.

At Sevastopol the President saw scenes of stark destruction by the Germans. The city was virtually leveled to the ground except for walls of homes and buildings which mines, bombs, and guns in recent battles left standing like billboards, mute testimony of horrific, wanton Nazi vengeance. The President said he lacked words to describe adequately such devastation. Out of thousands of buildings, he was told, only six were left in useful condition when the Germans fled.

In the dark hours of the next morning the President continued his trip by motor to an airfield where Foreign Commissar Molotov and a guard of honor were present to bid him farewell. There, airplanes of the United States Air Transport

Command were waiting to take him south to Egypt, a distance of about five and one-half hours' flying time. Measured by climates, however, the interval spelled the difference between the snow-capped mountains of the Crimea and the desert sands and the tropical scenery of the fertile Nile Delta. Cairo, where the President and Churchill met in December 1943, and traveled together to meet Marshal Stalin in Tehran, was within a few minutes' air reach of his stopping place on this visit.

On his previous visit the President went to see King Farouk, who was in a hospital recovering from injuries sustained in an automobile accident. This time, however, His Majesty was the President's first caller. He was received aboard a United States man-of-war at anchor in Great Bitter Lake, through which the Suez Canal passes. The President was on deck to greet the King when he arrived shortly before noon. As soon as the formalities of the meeting were over, the two were deep in earnest discussions of many questions affecting American-Egyptian relations. These continued through luncheon. Guests included United States Minister S. Pinkney Tuck; Hassanein Pasha, Chamberlain of the Royal Household; Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, the President's

Chief of Staff; Mrs. John Boettiger, the President's daughter; and Harry Hopkins, Special Assistant to the President.

Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, and the members of his staff were received later in the afternoon. He was accompanied by United States Minister J. K. Caldwell; Ras Kassa, President of the Crown Council; Ato Aklilou Habte Wold, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Ato Yilma Derra, Vice Minister of Finance, together with other advisers. The President conversed in French.

In talking with the Emperor, the President stressed communications between the United States and Ethiopia and said he hoped, with improvements of communications, particularly by air, the two countries would come to know each other better. The Emperor told the President of the many improvements recently made in Abyssinia and enthusiastically endorsed the President's hope for closer relations.

The President took advantage of the opportunity to thank the Emperor in person for the site and buildings he and the Empress gave the United States to use as a legation in Addis Ababa.

In his conversations earlier in the day with King Farouk, the President referred to the purchase by the United States of large quantities of long-staple Egyptian cotton during the war and stressed the hope that greatly increased exchange of other commodities would be developed in the future. The importance of two-way future trade was stressed. Tourist travel to Egypt, the President said, was certain to become greater after the war than before. He predicted thousands of Americans would visit Egypt and the Nile region after the war, by ship and by air.

King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia was received by the President amid colorful and impressive ceremonies. They met during the afternoon of the day following the President's reception of King Farouk and Emperor Haile Selassie.

The Arabian monarch had traveled more than 800 miles from the Red Sea port of Jidda in order that he might meet the President. It was the first time in his life that he had left his country's soil, and this was interpreted by members of his party as an unprecedented honor for the visiting Chief Executive of the United States.

The occasion, however, was notable in many other ways. A destroyer had been put at the King's disposal for the trip, and it was said to be

the first warship in history to enter the port of Jidda, as well as the first United States vessel of its kind to pass through the Suez Canal during World War II. The destroyer decks were covered with rich oriental rugs, while gilded chairs gave added touches of unusual splendor, as, also, did the flowing robes and accessories that make the Arabian dress so strikingly picturesque.

While a cabin was prepared for the King aboard his ship, he preferred to live out of doors. A tent, therefore, was set up on the forecastle deck, and he lived in it as if he were making a pilgrimage somewhere in the vast desert regions of Arabia. The King's entourage numbered 48, comprising his brother, Emir Abdullah; Emir Mohammed and Emir Mansour, sons of the King; Sheikh Abdullah Es-Suleiman, Minister of Finance; Sheikh Yussuf Yassin, Deputy Foreign Minister; Sheikh Hafiz Wahba, Minister to London; and others.

Col. William A. Eddy, Marine Corps, retired, now serving as American Minister to Saudi Arabia, also accompanied the King.

The President, seated on the forward gun deck of his ship, received the royal visitors as the crew manned the rails, bugle calls sounded, and the shrill notes of the boatswain's pipe kept all hands standing rigidly at attention.

The President and the King continued their talks long after the luncheon hour.

The discussions were in line with the President's desire that heads of governments throughout the world should get together whenever possible to talk as friends and exchange views in order better to understand the problems of one another.

Another conference between the President and Prime Minister Churchill was held at Alexandria. Although it lasted less than four hours—a brief affair when compared to the eight days they spent together with Marshal Stalin in the Crimea—the meeting in Egypt permitted new and important discussions of at least one subject which they could not take up before. That had to do with Japan and the war in the Pacific, where Soviet Russia is a neutral power.

Mr. Churchill told the President in blunt words that his government was determined to throw everything it had at the Japs as soon as Germany has been defeated and, meanwhile, would do all it could to strengthen its forces already engaged in that conflict.

Secretary Stettinius, en route from Moscow to make official calls in Liberia, southwest Africa, and Brazil and thence to the inter-American conference in Mexico City, was waiting to see the President when he reached Alexandria. The Secretary reported on the meetings he held in Moscow with Foreign Commissar Molotov. He told the President they had been altogether satisfactory and that he had thoroughly enjoyed his visit to the Russian capital.

Ambassador Winant had been invited to join the President's party and had come by air from London. He and the President spent hours together during the several days he remained with the party.

Two more ambassadors, Jefferson Caffery from Paris and Alexander Kirk from Rome, were found waiting in the French city of Algiers, the last stopping place on the road to Washington. They had been given advance notice of the President's coming, and, in that way, it was made possible for him personally to bring the three ambassadors up to date on all that took place in the Crimea Conference as well as to advise them fully regarding his meetings with the rulers of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Abyssinia.

When the President reaches Washington, he will have traveled approximately 14,000 miles—more than half-way around the world. At no time during his journeys, however, was he beyond almost instantaneous reach of the White House or other officials in Washington. This was made possible by communications facilities provided and operated by the Army and Navy. The volume of traffic, incoming and outgoing, remained continuously heavy but was moved with surprising speed and accuracy—without interruption or delay. Mail moved according to regularly planned schedules to and from the White House. And so it was possible for the President to keep pace with the demands of his office at home on the one hand and to attend to conference work on the other.

General de Gaulle, as President of the Provisional Government of France, was invited by President Roosevelt to meet with him in Algiers. The invitation was given the General in Paris by Ambassador Caffery and had been sent from Yalta, Crimea, six days in advance of his arrival in Algiers. In his message the President told the General he had hoped very much to meet him in

continental France but that time pressure made it impossible to get to Paris, much as he would like to do so. He again expressed warm thanks for the invitation the Government of France extended him when he was in Quebec attending the last conference there.

As dispatched from Yalta, the President's invitation concluded with an expression of real hope that the alternative proposal for a meeting in Algiers would be satisfactory to the French leader. The President was most disappointed when advised that official business did not permit the General to come to Algiers.

"Questions of mutual interest and importance to France and the United States are pending", the President said. "I wanted very much to see the General before leaving for home."

## Visit of the Secretary of State To Liberia

[Released to the press February 19]

The visit of the Secretary of State to Liberia on February 16, 1945 marks the first time an American Secretary of State has visited that Republic, and his stay there was regarded as an event of considerable importance.

Landing at Roberts Field late in the afternoon, the Secretary drove 52 miles by automobile to Monrovia, the capital of Liberia. On the way the Secretary and his party passed through the extensive plantations where natural rubber is collected for shipment to the United States.

President William V. S. Tubman, his entire Cabinet, the Chief Justice, a number of Senators, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives received the Secretary at the executive mansion in Monrovia.<sup>1</sup> Dinner at the executive mansion followed the reception, and the Secretary then returned to Roberts Field, taking off shortly after midnight for Natal.

President Tubman and his colleagues expressed their full appreciation of the Secretary's visit and showed the Secretary and his party the utmost hospitality. The Secretary was requested by President Tubman to convey his warmest personal greetings and best wishes to President Roosevelt.

<sup>1</sup> For the statement made by the Secretary on being received by President Tubman, see BULLETIN of Feb. 18, 1945, p. 219.

# Adherence by Venezuela to the Declaration by United Nations

## EXCHANGE OF COMMUNICATIONS

[Released to the press February 20]

FEBRUARY 16, 1945.

EXCELLENCY:

I have the honor to transmit to Your Excellency the following declaration given to the press last night by the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Venezuela:

"Declaration XV, proposed and signed by Venezuela in the Habana Meeting of Consultation and subsequently specially approved by the National Congress, is the origin and legal basis of the attitude adopted by the Republic by the side of the United Nations toward the aggressor Powers.

"The signatories of the above-mentioned document recognized and proclaimed that an attack by a non-American country against any nation of the Continent would be considered as an act of aggression against them all. It was in execution of that undertaking that the President of the Republic, at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, which occurred December 7, 1941, publicly stated the decision of the Government to keep faithfully its pledge of solidarity, and shortly afterward provided, in the Council of Ministers, for the breaking off of relations between Venezuela and the Axis Powers. This rupture and the decree whereby the effects of the Venezuelan neutrality legislation were suspended in favor of American countries at war mark precisely the moment when Venezuela abandoned her position as a neutral country.

"Days later, when the Third Meeting of Consultation was constituted at Rio de Janeiro, Venezuela proposed, together with Colombia and Mexico, that all the nations of America that had not done so should break off the diplomatic relations they had with the Axis countries and asked, with other Republics, that the American community adopt as its own the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter, to which it subsequently formally adhered.

"The Government of Venezuela has not hesitated to give to the United Nations, within its possibili-

ties, its political, economic and military cooperation. To this end it agreed with the Governments of the United States and the Netherlands on conditions for the defense in common of the Caribbean Sea and the Netherlands West Indies; it fortified certain points of the coast to cooperate in the action of the Allied bases; it agreed with the British Government on preventive measures for the defense of the Gulf of Paria; it fortified the Island of Patos and combined its action with that of the American base of Trinidad; it opened its ports and airports to the vessels and aircraft of friendly belligerent countries; it seized ships interned in Venezuela and belonging to totalitarian powers; it passed measures for watching and restraining the activities of aliens or nationals which might endanger the security of any American country; it placed under governmental control the movement of funds belonging to Axis citizens; it liquidated or expropriated commercial, industrial and transportation enterprises belonging to them and, in short, gave strict execution to all measures derived from the inter-American agreements of the country, always demonstrating its will to aid by all the means within its power the triumph of the United Nations.

"On its part the German Government has committed definite acts of aggression against the Republic, such as the sinking of vessels of national flag, with loss of Venezuelan lives, and recently went so far in its hostile attitude as the barbarous shooting of an illustrious prelate of our church.

"In virtue of such facts, and because they characterize unmistakably the situation created, the National Government recognizes the existence of a state of belligerency between Venezuela on the one hand and Germany and Japan on the other.

"The President of the Republic has accordingly conferred full powers on the Ambassador in Washington to sign the document of adherence of Venezuela to the Declaration by United Nations, dated January 1, 1942."

I avail [etc.]

ARTURO LARES  
His Excellency E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,  
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

FEBRUARY 19, 1945.

EXCELLENCY:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Embassy's note of February 16, 1945, in which it is stated that the National Government of Venezuela recognizes the existence of a state of belligerency between Venezuela on the one hand and Germany and Japan on the other, and that the President of the Republic of Venezuela has accordingly conferred full powers on you to sign for the adherence of Venezuela to the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942.

REMARKS BY THE AMBASSADOR OF VENEZUELA UPON SIGNING<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press February 20]

When the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, Venezuela was one of the first republics of the continent to sever diplomatic relations with the Axis governments, thus aligning itself with the nations that are defending the cause of right and justice, at a time when it seemed that these noble ideals were about to be submerged by a wave of aggression and barbarity. In doing so, my country was adhering to the attitude which it had assumed in numerous pan-American conferences, especially at the Habana Consultative Meeting of 1940. As will be remembered, Venezuela was the nation which there proposed the famous Declaration XV, whereby the American republics agreed to consult one another and to provide appropriate means of defense in case one of them should be the victim of an attack on the part of an extra-continental power. This Declaration has been the cornerstone of the inter-American system of cooperation and defense.

Since that time Venezuela has been cooperating with the Allied nations in the common effort to win the victory; we hastened to take necessary measures to prevent any act of sabotage against petroleum production, and today we can say that, due to this foresight, there has been no interruption at any time to our important supplies of that vital fuel for the Allied fleets and armies; we have agreed with the powers concerned upon military measures for the common defense of certain sectors of the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Paria; we have opened our ports and airfields to the vessels and airplanes of friendly belligerent nations; by means of drastic legislation we have frozen the funds and paralyzed and liquidated the businesses of Axis nationals; we have kept strict watch over

The Government of the United States, as depository for the Declaration, is gratified to welcome Venezuela formally into the ranks of the United Nations. Arrangements are being made for you to sign the Declaration on February 20, 1945.

Accept [etc.]

JOSEPH C. GREW  
Acting Secretary of State

His Excellency

Señor Dr. Don DIÓGENES ESCALANTE,  
Ambassador of Venezuela.

the subversive activities of the latter, placing some in confinement and imprisoning others. In short, we have given all that our resources and our capacity have permitted. In this attitude the Government of Venezuela has always had the unrestricted support of all its people, who, faithful to their traditions, have from the beginning of the struggle given all their moral support to the cause of the democracies.

To this action of alignment in the field of justice and civilization, the Axis responded with its accustomed scorn for human rights; Venezuelan lives and Venezuelan property were destroyed by Germany upon the sinking of vessels which flew our flag; and these deeds culminated recently in the shooting of Bishop Salvador Montes de Oca, the eminent prelate of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Venezuela. The energetic protests of my Government in all these cases have received a scornful silence from Germany as a reply.

In consequence of the situation which I mention, Venezuela has been in a *de facto* state of belligerency with the Axis powers since the days of Pearl Harbor, and it is this *de facto* state which my Government has regularized into a *de jure* state by declaring officially, on the fourteenth instant, such belligerency toward Germany and Japan.

Thus formalizing its original attitude, Venezuela will continue to cooperate faithfully with the United Nations, by every means within its power, in the common effort to obtain the victory and a new order of things which will consecrate the principles of the Atlantic Charter and guarantee to nations and to men the right to live free and in peace.

<sup>1</sup> Made at the Department of State on Feb. 20, 1945.

It is a great honor for me to fulfil the mandate which His Excellency President General Isaías Medina Angarita has given me to sign, in the name of the Government over which he presides, Venezuela's formal adherence to the Declaration by the United Nations.

#### REMARKS BY ACTING SECRETARY GREW<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press February 20]

We are happy to welcome Venezuela formally into the ranks of the United Nations. Long ago Venezuela aligned itself firmly with us by breaking relations with the Axis and by taking effective measures to control and suppress Axis activities. Venezuela has rendered and is rendering important contributions to the prosecution of the war, placing its vast petroleum resources at the disposition of the United Nations and making available

its other products. We are confident that Venezuela will continue its faithful cooperation with the United Nations in the common war effort.

We are making steady advances toward complete victory over our enemies, but we know that many months may elapse before all of the Axis forces have laid down their arms. It is heartening to have Venezuela attach its signature to the compact of the United Nations and thus become formally joined with the other nations which have pledged their full resources in the war against the Axis.

As the aims of the United Nations contemplate the building of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security in the future, we welcome Venezuela as a full partner in that great task. We need the collaboration of all governments and peoples who would live free and in peace.

## Adherence by Uruguay to the Declaration by United Nations

#### EXCHANGE OF COMMUNICATIONS

[Released to the press February 24]

An exchange of communications regarding the adherence of Uruguay to the Declaration by United Nations follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1945.

I have to communicate to Your Excellency that by means of a law and decree adopted yesterday, the Oriental Republic of Uruguay declared itself in a state of war against Germany and Japan. By this act the Uruguayan people and Government, fully united with the forces defending the rights of humanity since the beginning of the present conflict, assume in law the position which they have occupied in fact especially since the attack on Pearl Harbor; and bring to culmination a procedure guided always by their democratic traditions and their profound faith in justice and right. Likewise, it has been decided to adhere to the Declaration by United Nations signed at Washington January 1, 1942, and for this purpose our Ambassador in Washington is authorized to sign it in the name of the Republic.

Accept, Excellency, my best wishes for your personal well-being.

JOSE SERRATO  
Minister of Foreign Relations

FEBRUARY 24, 1945.

I have received your telegram of February 23, 1945, stating that by means of a law and decree of February 22 Uruguay declares itself in a state of war against Germany and Japan; that by this act the Uruguayan people and Government, fully united with the forces defending the rights of humanity since the beginning of the present conflict, assume in law the position which they have occupied in fact especially since the attack on Pearl Harbor; that Uruguay has decided to adhere to the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942; and that the Uruguayan Ambassador at Washington has been authorized to sign the Declaration in the name of Uruguay.

The Government of the United States, as depository for the Declaration, is gratified to welcome Uruguay formally into the ranks of the United Nations. Ambassador Blanco is signing the Declaration on this date, February 24, 1945.

Please accept [etc.]

JOSEPH C. GREW  
Acting Secretary of State

<sup>1</sup> Made at the Department of State on the occasion of the signing by Venezuela.

# International Understanding: A Foundation for the Peace

By DOROTHY FOSDICK<sup>1</sup>

THE PROMOTION of understanding and friendship across national lines has been one of the most popular activities undertaken by educational institutions and internationally minded private agencies in this country. Yet today many people are asking what really important result comes from these efforts. Do student exchanges, international meetings, the distribution of literature on other lands, international festivals, for example, have any real significance in such a cataclysmic time? It is readily understandable how the international attitudes of those who directly participate in these efforts are strengthened. But what relation do these efforts have to the grave political issues of our day? Settlement of those issues does not seem to depend upon the people's small efforts. While it is neighborly and fun to work to promote better understanding among the peoples of the world, many persons deep in their hearts seem increasingly to doubt whether such activities really are worth it! In the interests of enduring peace those who have these doubts must have their faith renewed.

## I

A first fact that needs to be emphasized is that one can no longer rely simply on the understanding and knowledge of the politician and of the statesman for the formulation of our foreign policy. In the modern world the peoples as well as the governments participate in the formulation and development of foreign policies. Not many years back some governments determined upon policies and pursued them without much reference to their people. Today, however, governments listen to the people. The Nazi Government in Germany and the militarist Government in Japan have recognized this necessity. Because they are afraid of the people, those Governments do everything in their power to create "followers", putting into their mouths what they want them to say. They deprive them of a free vote and break up their free associations. They regiment the press, the radio, and the lecture platform. They use the

most modern techniques to befuddle and deceive systematically.

In a democracy like ours, however, the people can vote. They are organized into local, state, and national groups of a bewildering variety. The people have at their disposal the press, radio, and the forum. They speak for themselves. The Government thus relies on the people: It counts for a great proportion of its ideas on the spontaneous discussions of the people; it molds its policies to meet their demands; it explains its decisions.

The whole people now must gain something of the knowledge and understanding that once only the politician and the statesman needed. They must know what the life of other peoples is like, what they have suffered during these tragic years of war, what they value as a people, in what they are skilled and what not skilled, their character, their qualities, and their beliefs. They must know enough to be able to interpret what they hear and read about other peoples. They must learn their habits of humor so that they will understand the tone of what is said. Only through such a knowledge and understanding can the whole people live up to their new responsibility.

## II

A second fact is that one cannot rely simply on the understanding and knowledge of the foreign offices to assure sound conduct of our foreign relations. In the old days the foreign offices operated in a world apart; today the people participate with the foreign offices in the day-to-day contacts which make up our international relations. The people of one country now talk directly through the forums, in the press, and on the radio to the people in another country. Recently this situation was illustrated in the debate on foreign policy between certain sections of the American and the British press. This was not an isolated

<sup>1</sup> Miss Fosdick is Assistant in International Organization, Division of International Organization Affairs, Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State.

or peculiar incident; it was merely an unusually dramatic one. The revolutionary means of modern communication have put people everywhere into common intercommunication. Messages are now carried, moreover, not to a single listener nor to a few correspondents but to millions of listeners and to millions of readers. Assistant Secretary MacLeish recently wrote: "Whether we like it or not we will find ourselves living at the war's end in a speaking, listening net of international intercommunication so sensitive and so delicately responsive that a whisper anywhere will be heard around the earth."<sup>1</sup>

In this sort of a world a common understanding and a mutual confidence is not a luxury. If ill-tempered and irresponsible talk prevails, constructive efforts are imperiled. If men doubt each other's purposes and misunderstand each other's intentions, the hands of their governments in trying to organize the world for peace are seriously weakened. There must be free, frank, and open exchanges of opinion among the peoples. But it is essential that such exchanges be rooted in an appreciation of each other's interests, in trust in each other's purposes, and in a belief that the common cause of all the people everywhere is peace.

### III

The most important task now confronting both the peoples and their governments is to build for an enduring peace. To carry this task through, the major Allies, who now bear the main responsibility for bringing the war to a successful conclusion, must continue to *work together* in building the peace. If this indispensable collaboration is to continue, a firm foundation of mutual trust and understanding between these states must be developed.

During this war, in spite of some differences among the major Allies, a determination to trust each other and to work together has always been evident. This determination roots partly in a genuine appreciation of each other's interests. But this determination comes also from an understanding of the common fate that all would share if the menace of Fascism prevailed. This sense of common destiny has led the four major Allies not only to cooperate in the war but it has led them

also to take important joint steps to prepare for the peace.

The United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China have committed themselves in the Moscow Declaration, even in the midst of war, to the establishment of a permanent general international organization to preserve the peace after the war.

Preliminary conversations already have been held among these same four states. At those Conversations this summer at Dumbarton Oaks a general plan for the principles, machinery, and powers of the general Organization was tentatively agreed upon. As one who was at those Conversations during the seven weeks, I can testify to the genuinely cooperative and accommodating spirit that prevailed throughout. Full and frank discussion took place in plenary conference sessions, in committee meetings, and in informal discussions out in the gardens of Dumbarton Oaks, on the terrace of the swimming pool, and across the card-tables set up at lunchtime under the oak trees. Everyone there labored patiently and hopefully to achieve a genuine understanding and agreement. Under Secretary Grew recently made the statement that "in the many international conferences in which I have participated during the past 40 years I have never experienced such a seriousness of purpose, nor such a sense of responsibility, as that displayed at Dumbarton Oaks".<sup>2</sup>

The joint plan that issued from these Conversations, known to most of us as the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, is now before the people for their study and discussion. Unlike a draft treaty, the form in which the League of Nations first came before the public, the Proposals are in the form of a plan of organization which the people as well as other governments have been invited to study and comment upon.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals will be used as a basis of discussion at the United Nations conference to be held in San Francisco beginning on April 25. This conference, representing a great body of states, will prepare the Charter of the Organization in the form of a treaty to be submitted to the various governments for their ratification.

The procedure followed in planning for and in establishing the general Organization is a great tribute to the possibilities of joint action by the major Allies. But once the fear of their common fate is removed by the collapse of Germany and

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Jan. 14, 1945, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of Dec. 17, 1944, p. 743.

Japan, the continued cooperation of those Allies will depend primarily upon the respect which the people have for each other and upon their recognition of a common interest in the peace. With the collapse of the common foe we will be thrown back again on the more enduring and less dramatic ties of friendship and trust. If we are not prepared to do everything we can to cultivate these ties, we will run the risk of the major Allies' going in different directions.

Such a development would be truly disastrous. The Organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks can be successful only if the principal powers fully and whole-heartedly cooperate to make it effective. If the major powers develop fundamentally divergent policies and if they persist in pursuing those policies at the expense of the cooperative effort to preserve international peace and security, no arrangements can finally preserve the peace whether they are bilateral, regional, or universal. In any relation we can expect some strains and stresses. Differences are inevitable, as Marshal Stalin wisely reminded us in his recent speech on foreign policy. The crucial requirement is to stand together and to deal with differences as they arise. To do this, the major powers must have underlying respect for each other and a live recognition of mutual interests and common objectives. No more important work can be done than to cement the ties between ourselves, and between the peoples of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and France so that these peoples may become the solid nucleus of a world organization embracing eventually all nations.

#### IV

To build for an enduring peace, it is not enough that only the major Allies work together. If there is machinery to bring only the major states together, those states would soon find themselves in the dubious position of having to impose their decisions upon the other nations. Such a situation would be inherently unjust and unstable. A positive and constructive peace requires that all peace-loving states, regardless of their size or power, should collaborate. Only in a climate of understanding can such general collaboration be sustained.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals envisage international machinery and procedures through which all nations devoted to peace would work together

in the common task of preserving peace. Membership in the Organization would be open to all peace-loving states. Since it would be the prime concern of the Organization to have as many states as possible become peace-loving, the membership provisions point toward universality.

In public comment on the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals the pacific settlement and enforcement arrangements in the plan have received most attention. Those arrangements are indeed central. Another vital aspect of the Proposals, however, should be pointed out—the arrangements for co-operation to create positively the conditions conducive to peace. The Proposals vest in the General Assembly, in which all states members of the Organization would be represented, and in an economic and social council under its authority, responsibility for promoting the solution of international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems and the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Picture to yourselves this Economic and Social Council, composed of representatives of 18 member countries elected every 3 years by the General Assembly, dedicated to assisting the nations to advance their welfare and to solve their urgent problems, among others, of food, finance, health, and education. Working with this widely representative agency and under its direction would be a number of highly competent commissions, staffed by experts and research specialists in the various fields calling for international collaboration. Then all the existing and projected specialized international agencies dealing with economics, finance, agriculture, education, aviation, relief, and other matters would be brought into relation with the Organization on mutually agreeable terms. The Economic and Social Council would offer a means of assisting in the coordinating of the activities of these organizations and in supplementing their work. The General Assembly, meanwhile, would back up the Economic and Social Council, would stimulate it into greater activity, and would review its work.

For these arrangements actually to breathe with life and activity, however, the peoples must have a real desire to help each other solve each other's problems. They must feel that it is worthwhile that men and women everywhere should have better ways of living, better education for their children, and more freedom, and a better chance for

a person to live up to the best that is in him. For this conviction to go deep enough to last through the inevitable strains and stresses of such a large-scale cooperative effort, there must be a real sense of living men and women around the world, a solid respect for people as people. If this positive approach to the peace is to flourish, mutual respect among the peoples of the world must be cultivated.

## V

We are fortunate in this country to be so well prepared for the task of extending understanding across national lines. Our great institutions of education and of culture and our many internationally minded private agencies are able to shoulder the main responsibility. Moreover, the program of cultural relations is at the center of the concerns of the Department of State. The Department does not consider its program in this field a decoration, a frill, or an ornament added to the otherwise serious business of foreign relations.

The Department, together with the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, has for a number of years carried on a reciprocal program of cultural relations with the other American republics. Such a program includes the exchanges of professors and students, dissemination of books, periodicals, and movies, special radio broadcasts, and technical missions requested by the states to assist in development projects. The Department is looking forward to the extension of such a program among the other nations and peoples of the world. On March 31, 1944 the Department issued a statement indicating that it wished increasingly to encourage democratic international cooperation in developing, on a reciprocal basis, desirable educational and cultural relations among the nations and peoples of the world especially looking toward the promotion of free and friendly intercourse among them in the interest of international peace and security.

In April 1944 the State Department sent a delegation of six to the Meeting of Allied Ministers of Education held in London. There they met with representatives of ten of the United Nations who had been meeting periodically ever since the autumn of 1942. Also present were observers from Soviet Russia, the British Dominions, and India. In the course of this meeting and under the chairmanship of Representative Fulbright a tentative draft constitution for a provisional

United Nations Organization for Educational and Cultural Reconstruction was prepared, which since then has been submitted to all the United Nations and to the governments associated with them in this war. That work done in London, which is now being studied by the interested governments, lays the groundwork for an international organization for educational and cultural development, which could be included among the specialized agencies related to the general Organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks.

One question that may be of special interest, on which the State Department has been working, is whether an agreement among the nations relating to the free interchange of news and of information would be feasible. Such freedom of information would include the right of all responsible persons and agencies engaged in gathering and disseminating information to the public of their own countries to discharge, without restraint or hindrance, that function in other countries where they may be stationed, and, in discharging that function, to have unimpeded access to all means of communication. Conversely, each nation would permit the reception within territories under its control of information so gathered in other countries, in order that its people may be adequately informed. One can readily understand how this type of agreement, if its principles were to embrace all modern forms of information, including the press, the radio, and the motion picture, and if approved by a large number of states, would constitute a realistic foundation for more adequate exchange of knowledge. Such an agreement might well grow out of discussions in the General Assembly or in the Economic and Social Council of the new Organization.

Another matter which is of particular interest to the Department of State is the possibility of using the motion-picture film more widely as a medium of information. Foreign countries are constantly making requests to the Department for motion pictures depicting patterns of American life, activities of our vocational groups, and even the physical characteristics of this country. Some agency of the new international Organization very probably can render effective assistance in extending the use and exchange of motion pictures that will interpret more adequately the peoples of the world to one another.

(Continued on page 315)

# Principles of Economic Policy

*Address by WILLIAM S. CULBERTSON<sup>1</sup>*

[Released to the press February 23]

I rise this evening to reaffirm my faith in the principles of economic liberty and economic equality. The occasion which brings us together invites such declaration. These principles, of which Cordell Hull is the prophet in the modern world, are our economic heritage from the American and French Revolutions. For me they are still self-evident truths.

Perhaps at this time I am a little more conscious than ever before of my convictions concerning world economic policy. My colleagues and I have just returned from a special mission to French North Africa, to the Middle East, and to Italy. The controlling objective of the mission was the reassertion of the principles of economic liberty and economic equality.<sup>2</sup> Under instructions which visualized for the future the resumption of private enterprise in trade and industry, we entered areas already feeling the burden which war controls and war restrictions had imposed. We studied the problem assigned to us through the experiences not only of the highest officials in each country but through the experiences of the businessmen who are carrying on economic life from day to day. We emerged from our interesting and at times difficult mission still with faith in the philosophy which America and France gave to the world at the end of the eighteenth century. We rediscovered that now no more than then can humanity lift itself by its economic bootstraps. We rediscovered that we cannot raise our standard of living by building political barriers around poverty. We rediscovered that government in business, whether it be a purchasing commission or a commercial corporation, cannot produce the kind of creative power which comes to a society through individual initiative, economic adventure, and enterprise.

A month or so ago, I had the privilege of exchanging views with the French Government in Paris on the subject of the resumption of private

trade in French North and West Africa. The French Government, after careful study, assured me that it is in agreement with the objective which I presented and that steps would be taken in the immediate future to restore trade to private channels in French North and West Africa. Following the announcement of this understanding there developed in certain quarters a critical attitude due to the fact that all barriers to trade did not disappear overnight. Let us try to understand the situation. For a number of years French North and West Africa have been under a war economy. The channels of economic life became established through government controls and restrictions which were entirely relevant under the regime of war. Economic demobilization could not take place in a few weeks. The protection of the very situation we were trying to conserve called for an orderly and gradual return to the system of private trade. The agreement which was made in Paris assumed that this process would take at least six months. The important result is that a trend was established by the American and French Governments and that the negotiations in Paris constitute a significant development in the pattern of United Nations post-war commercial relations.

## II

The work of our mission in French North Africa and in the Middle East is in the over-all view of great events today only "a little cloud out of the sea, like a man's hand". It may, as clouds do, blow away, or, as in the experience of the ancient prophet on Carmel, it may become a storm. I hope that under the leadership of the western states the traditions of economic liberty and economic equality may be translated into an active expanding system of trade and industry dominating the post-military world. Such a system will come when currencies are stabilized, exchanges freed, excessive barriers lessened, direct controls and discriminations removed, and genuine guarantees of most-favored-nation treatment and national treatment secured. If nations in world council can unite on an economic policy which will free trade and industry from the shackles of restriction and dis-

<sup>1</sup> Delivered at New York, N. Y., Feb. 22, 1945 before the American Chamber of Commerce in France. Col. Culbertson is chairman of the Special Economic Mission to North Africa.

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of Dec. 10, 1944, p. 720.

crimination and from a reliance on political power; if the international organization to be set up will make effective a set of fair rules for all peoples, then private business can thrive and grow without the intervention and support of government.<sup>1</sup>

Let us not underestimate the obstacles which are in our path. Unfortunately the economic creed of Fascism is not retreating with the German Armies. Under the necessities of war governments have tasted the blood of economic power. Fears and uncertainties have encouraged plans for the retention in the post-war period of the alliance between the state and economic activities. Large groups of people have been taught to associate their livelihood and security with government-in-business.

I am concerned this evening with the effect of this tendency on international economic relations, where the odds even before the war were heavily against economic liberty and economic equality. In the western world influential forces are today adding new arguments in favor of preferences enforced by political power, dependency maintained through financial controls, state monopolies, and trading corporations, and special treaties which create conditions within weaker countries from which economic advantages flow to the dominant power.

These conditions and tendencies are challenges to groups of individuals, chambers of commerce, and governments which believe in economic liberty and economic equality. Our first privilege and duty is to use our influence to change these conditions and to reverse these tendencies. The use of political power, no matter how plausible its legal basis may be, to support discriminatory trade and industry in areas, colonial or otherwise, where local people desire and need a system of economic liberty and economic equality, invites economic warfare. Such policy may be tolerated for a while, as it has been, but in the end opposing power will assert itself against it.

It would seem inevitable that if private-enterprise states lose their struggle to render effective the principle of economic liberty and economic equality, they will have to support their traders and producers in world markets with such influence and such instrumentalities as are necessary to establish equality of opportunity and treatment.

This dilemma of economic policy should be pondered by both sides in the great debate over the

system which is to govern the economic relations of peoples in the post-war world.

### III

It is particularly relevant on this occasion to speak of the status of Morocco as a symbol of the principles in which I am reaffirming my faith tonight. One of the fundamental international documents affecting economic activities with and within Morocco is the Algeciras convention of 1906. The controlling phrase in this convention is "economic liberty without any inequality". I am not sure that the full force of this phrase has been appreciated. The part of the phrase which is usually emphasized is "without any inequality"; that is, the principle of the open door. In other words, goods from whatever source arriving are assured equality of treatment in the application of customs duties, customs evaluation, port charges, and all other controls affecting their entrance into the area. The phrase "economic liberty without any inequality", however, has a much broader interpretation. The phrase "economic liberty" may be construed apart from the amplifying phrase which follows it. Moreover, the word "economic" is broader than "commercial". It comprehends the whole range of activities by which men seek to live. This interpretation is supported by the contents of the convention, which includes the creation of a bank, public services, public works, and other internal economic affairs. With respect to all of these activities, the phrase "economic liberty" is controlling.

I emphasize tonight the economic guarantees governing Morocco, not only because they are important in themselves but also because here is a pattern which gives a touch of reality to my plea for economic liberty and economic equality. These principles, expanded into a working universal system, are an essential part of a world order which has for its objectives prosperity, stability, and security. They are a part of the noblest traditions of Great Britain, France, and the United States. They are our contribution to the post-war world.

### IV

I have found in the discussion of post-war problems, especially across the Atlantic, a tendency to overemphasize the "transition period" after the

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1945, p. 80.

war. So long as this phrase covers merely a period of active change-over from war economy to peace economy, no exception can be taken to it. But in some plans for the future it seems to be treated as a sort of catch-all into which unsolved and seemingly insoluble problems are dumped in the hope that in some mysterious way they will solve themselves with the passage of time.

May I be pardoned if I revert again to the instructions of our mission. In my opinion, these reveal a wise approach to this problem. They sought to deal with post-military problems while they were still flexible and while the issues involved had at least some defenders on both sides. They gave support to the view that to retain wartime controls and government participation in business after their wartime justification had gone tends to weld such restrictive practices into a permanent commercial system. It was recognized that adjustments take time but that no situation exists which will not yield to constructive treatment if the will exists among the nations to return to a healthy, wealth-creating economic system.

After formal hostilities cease, the peoples of the world are all going to be in the same economic boat. It is not going to be a good boat. The people of the United States and France will be in that boat along with the others. A popular idea is current, encouraged by views expressed by certain individuals and groups in other countries, that the United States is going to be much better off than other countries and that it is therefore necessary, so the argument runs, that the United States assume a special benevolent attitude toward the rest of the world. It is true that we have not suffered as much physical destruction as certain other countries, but wounds may be serious even when they are not bleeding. The disorganizing and destructive effect of the war on America's complex economy should not be underestimated. We, too, are paying and paying destructively for this war.

I am happy that a cooperative attitude prevails in the councils of the American Government. We have reason to expect that a similar attitude will prevail in the councils of other nations. Special economic regimes or dispensations lead to misunderstandings. The economic structure of the post-war world should rest on mutual exchange and mutual respect. I have reaffirmed my faith in the

principles of economic liberty and economic equality this evening because they should and can constitute a part of that structure through which peoples may pool their hopes, their objectives, and their aspirations for a secure and prosperous world.

## International Cotton Advisory Committee

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF FOURTH MEETING

[Released to the press February 22]

The International Cotton Advisory Committee, established in September 1939 to study and report on problems in the world's cotton industry, will open its fourth meeting in Washington on March 26, 1945. In addition to the United States the countries which are members of this Committee and which are expected to send delegates are Brazil, Egypt, India, Peru, Mexico, Turkey, the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the British and French cotton-exporting colonies.<sup>1</sup>

The primary objective of the discussions will be to survey the various aspects of the world cotton situation, especially problems affecting international trade in that commodity, and to formulate recommendations for subsequent consideration by the individual countries for the solution of such problems.

The International Cotton Advisory Committee, consisting of representatives from the countries mentioned above, was established in accordance with the recommendations of the International Cotton Conference held in Washington in September 1939, under the following terms of reference: To observe and keep in close touch with developments in the world cotton situation, and to suggest to the various Governments concerned, as and when advisable, any measure it considered suitable and practicable for the achievement of ultimate international collaboration in the solution of world cotton problems.

Previous meetings of the Committee, all of them in Washington, were held on April 1, 1940, October 17, 1940, and April 11, 1941. Leslie A. Wheeler, Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, is the Chairman of the Committee and will preside at the opening session of the March meeting.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Jan. 14, 1945, p. 52.

# United States - Mexican Water Treaty

*Statement by ASSISTANT SECRETARY ACHESON<sup>1</sup>*

[Released to the press February 21]

**MR. CHAIRMAN, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:** I should like only very briefly to touch upon some of the more important aspects of the pending treaty which have not in my opinion been sufficiently emphasized during these hearings.

First, as to the arbitration point: You have heard Mr. English of the Department of State analyze in detail the legal aspects of this question as bearing upon our possible obligation under existing treaty provisions to submit to arbitration the question of the apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River if it should not be disposed of by this treaty.

But it seems to me that there is a much larger question involved in this matter than the interpretation of existing arbitration treaties and legal precedents. None of us, whether opponents or proponents of the treaty, can doubt that this question between the United States and Mexico must be settled by treaty or by arbitration. It is absolutely unthinkable to me, or to any of you gentlemen, I am sure, that we could continue to let this matter go unsettled until a time when the necessity to settle it could begin to raise issues of international hostility, and even more unthinkable that we should ever rely upon superior strength to prevent a settlement.

The United States Government, with the full support of the people and the Congress, is now taking the lead in establishing an international organization to maintain peace based upon principles of cooperation between nations and regard for mutual sovereign rights. We have held ourselves out to the world as the principal exponent among nations of cooperative action, including the arbitration of international disputes. In the Western Hemisphere we have had for many years practical experience in working out our problems through consultation and exchange of views on the basis of equality between nations. During this war the solidarity of the American republics has been an example of what can be accomplished through this

system which we can hold up with pride to the rest of the world. The current meeting in Mexico City is another and outstanding manifestation of this spirit of unity. It will stand us in good stead when we come to the vital problems of the San Francisco conference later this spring. And in this whole pattern, no better example of friendship between two countries can be found than that which has existed during this war between ourselves and Mexico, our nearest neighbor. The fact that such a state of affairs has not always existed between our two countries makes it even more striking that we are now receiving such unstinting support from Mexico.

And so I say that in this background our Government simply could not afford to let this question of the waters of the Colorado River continue unsettled to plague our relations with Mexico for years to come. If this treaty should be defeated and if subsequently Mexico should request that the matter be arbitrated, I do not see how as a matter of policy—entirely aside from treaties and legal precedents—we in the Department of State or you in the Senate could refuse such a request. There would be too much at stake in relation both to Mexico and to our total aims in the field of foreign affairs to justify our refusing to do so for any reason.

As to what the outcome of such arbitration might be I am not prepared to say. But it is our strong feeling in the Department of State that our own interests in this country, in California as well as in the other basin States, would be seriously endangered by a continuation of the present situation. That is one of the reasons why we have pressed for the treaty and the main reason I am sure why representatives of five of the basin States have strongly supported our efforts. Today some 8,000,000 acre-feet a year of this water are wasting through Mexican territory. There is nothing to stop Mexico's using more and more of this water as time goes on. And regardless of what the legal niceties may be, let no one be deceived that the longer this building up of use continues, the more difficult it will be to negotiate a settlement on anything like as favorable a basis as we have here.

<sup>1</sup> Made on Feb. 21, 1945 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. For article on the United States - Mexican Water Treaty, see BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1945, p. 71.

After months of the hardest bargaining on the basis of the Santa Fe formula, the Department of State arrived at a solution which we believe is the most favorable from our country's point of view that we can now obtain if we are going to settle this matter through negotiation or arbitration. As one student of the problem has said in referring to the question of return flow: "Indeed, it may be observed that the representatives of the United States should be commended highly for securing such a desirable provision in the treaty." Two years or five years from now we would probably have to contend with increased Mexican uses of water. It is difficult to see how under such circumstances we could obtain agreement from Mexico to make greater reductions in the amount of water put to use in its territory.

The argument has been made by able lawyers for its opponents that this treaty is in conflict with the provisions of section 1 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. This argument, as Mr. Clayton, Mr. Breitenstein, and Judge Stone have pointed out, ignores the clear effect of the provisions of the act and the Colorado River Compact which envisage and make provision for a treaty with Mexico, as well as the fact that when the Boulder Canyon Project Act was enacted there was on the statute books of the United States an act of Congress authorizing the negotiation of a treaty with reference to these rivers. Furthermore, as Mr. Carson and Judge Stone have pointed out, this argument is irrelevant in view of the fact that it will be Davis Dam and not Boulder Dam from which water will be metered out to fulfil the treaty requirements. The logical conclusion of the legal argument of the opponents of the treaty appears to be that an upstream nation by unilateral act in its own territory can impinge upon the rights of a downstream nation; this is hardly the kind of legal doctrine that can be seriously urged in these times.

The accusation has been made by some that the Department of State and the International Boundary Commission have invented this treaty; that it is arbitrary; and that we have been outtraded. This is in direct conflict with the facts. For some 20 years our Government has been trying to arrive at a solution of this problem, both before and after the construction of Boulder Dam and during both Republican and Democratic administrations. At all times the bases under which these negotiations

**Statement by ACTING SECRETARY GREW**

[Released to the press February 23]

I am indeed gratified to learn that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has today favorably reported the water treaty with Mexico. This action will be received with acclaim by our friends throughout the Americas.

have been carried on have been substantially similar; as pointed out by Mr. Lawson, Mr. Tipton, and others, the Santa Fe formula is not materially different in result from the so-called "Mead formula" offered to Mexico in 1929 when its uses were much lower than they are today. At all times the Department and the Commission have consulted closely with, and been guided by the views and interests of, water users in the Colorado River basin. The terms of the treaty are more favorable to the United States than the Santa Fe formula, which was approved by a large majority of the Committee of Sixteen of the basin States. The treaty actually will result in curtailing Mexico's present use. It is absurd under these circumstances to claim that the treaty will facilitate unlimited, or in fact any, additional development in Mexico at our expense—although the reverse might well be true if through short-sightedness this treaty were defeated. It is in short a fair and hard-headed solution to an increasingly troublesome situation.

For over 50 years the problem of the division of the water of these international streams has been one of the principal matters pending between the United States and Mexico. As development has increased in the two countries, the problem has increased in difficulty, and it is now the major potential source of friction between our two countries.

The United States is now moving into an era of increasingly intimate contact with foreign nations in fields which run the gamut of military, political, economic, and social relations of the most complex variety. It is an era during which our country must exercise full leadership if our efforts and our hopes are to bear fruit. But what assurance can there be for anyone, in this country or out, that we can even begin to measure up to these problems

if we cannot settle the most rudimentary type of bilateral problem that can ever arise in the field of foreign relations, namely, a border problem arising from the fact of geographical propinquity?

I do not wish unduly to magnify this point since the treaty must be judged on its merits. But I have thought it necessary to try to set the matter in some perspective in relation to the total picture with which we are trying to deal. This session will be the most important in our history in the field of foreign affairs, and this is the first matter which has come before you during the session. It is my fervent hope, as it is that of Secretary Stettinius and of our great former Secretary Hull who negotiated and signed this treaty, that favorable action will soon be forthcoming from you on this important matter.

## Renewal of Diplomatic Relations with El Salvador

*Statement by ACTING SECRETARY GREW*

[Released to the press February 19]

The Department on February 19 instructed the American Embassy at San Salvador to renew relations with the Government of El Salvador.

The Provisional President of El Salvador resigned on October 20, 1944, and the powers of Government were assumed by Colonel Osmín Aguirre. Consultations were immediately initiated between the American republics, under resolution XXII of the Advisory Committee for Political Defense at Montevideo, to determine whether the change of Government had been brought about through Axis influence. While these consultations elicited no charges that the new regime had come into power through Axis influence within the terms of resolution XXII, they demonstrated that there was no consensus in favor of recognition, on the grounds that the stability of the Aguirre regime was not assured. The consultations were continued and now show that, in the light of recent developments in El Salvador, there is general agreement that the Government of El Salvador fulfills the requirements of international law for recognition: (a) control of the machinery of government and of the country; (b) general support without active opposition; and (c) declaration of intention to fulfil its

international obligations and ability to do so. Therefore, on February 19, pursuant to traditional hemisphere policy, our Embassy was instructed to renew relations.

## Twenty-seventh Anniversary Of the Red Army

[Released to the press February 23]

The President has sent the following message to Marshal Joseph V. Stalin on the occasion of the twenty-seventh anniversary of the Red Army:

"FEBRUARY 23, 1945.

"His Excellency

"JOSEPH V. STALIN,

"Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces  
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,  
"Moscow.

"In anticipation of our common victory against the Nazi oppressors, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to you as Supreme Commander on this the twenty-seventh anniversary of the founding of the Red Army.

"The far reaching decisions we took at Yalta will hasten victory and the establishment of a firm foundation for a lasting peace. The continued outstanding achievements of the Red Army together with the all-out effort of the United Nations forces in the south and the west assure the speedy attainment of our common goal—a peaceful world based upon mutual understanding and cooperation.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

## Death of the Prime Minister Of Egypt

[Released to the press February 24]

Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew has today sent the following message to the American Minister at Cairo:

"Please immediately inform the Egyptian Foreign Minister of the deep distress caused this Government by the report of the assassination of the Prime Minister Ahmed Maher Pasha. The loss to Egypt of this distinguished leader has profoundly shocked the American people."

# Civil Air-Transport Agreement Between Canada and the United States

[Released to the press February 19]

A new civil air-transport agreement between the United States and Canada became effective February 19 in accordance with notes exchanged on February 17 between the Department of State and the Canadian Ambassador in Washington, the Honorable L. B. Pearson. The new agreement, which is based on discussions recently held in New York between representatives of the two Governments, supersedes the 1939 bilateral arrangement, which had been extended by supplementary arrangements of 1940 and 1943.<sup>1</sup>

The new agreement provides for an increase in the number of routes to be operated by the airlines of each country. United States airlines are authorized to fly the following routes: Boston to Moncton; Boston to Montreal; New York or Boston to Quebec; New York to Montreal and Ottawa; Washington to Montreal and Ottawa; Buffalo to Toronto; Fargo to Winnipeg; Great Falls to Lethbridge; Seattle to Vancouver; Seattle to Whitehorse; Fairbanks to Whitehorse.

The routes authorized for operation by Canadian airlines are as follows: Halifax to Boston; Toronto to New York; Toronto to Cleveland; Toronto to Chicago; Port Arthur to Duluth; Victoria to Seattle; Whitehorse to Fairbanks.

The agreement follows the general lines of the standard form of bilateral agreement adopted at the Chicago aviation conference. It also makes specific provision for the reciprocal grant of the Two Freedoms—the right of transit and non-traffic stop—which will permit American air services to operate through Canada on routes to Europe and the Orient.

A copy of the note from the Canadian Ambassador, giving the text of the agreement and the accompanying annex, as well as a copy of the note of acceptance by the United States Government, are attached hereto.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
February 17, 1945.

No. 46  
SIR,

With reference to negotiations that have recently taken place between representatives of the

Canadian and United States Governments concerning civil air transport, I have the honour to propose that an agreement be entered into between the two Governments as follows:

## AGREEMENT FOR CIVIL AIR TRANSPORT BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

### Article I

Pending the coming into force of the International Air Services Transit Agreement done at Chicago on December 7, 1944, each Government grants to the other, in respect of its scheduled international air services, the right to fly across its territory without landing and the right to land for non-traffic purposes.

### Article II

The Governments grant the rights specified in the Annex for establishing the international civil air routes and services described in the Annex, whether such services be inaugurated immediately or at a later date at the option of the Government to whom the rights are granted.

### Article III

Each of the air services so described may be placed in operation when the Government to whom the rights have been granted by Article II to designate an airline or airlines for the route concerned has authorized an airline for such route, and the Government granting the rights shall, subject to Article V hereof, take the appropriate steps to permit the operation by the airline or airlines concerned: provided that the airline so designated may be required to qualify before the competent aeronautical authorities of the Government granting the rights under the laws and regulations normally applied by these authorities before being permitted to engage in the operations contemplated by this Agreement; and provided that in areas of hostilities or of military occupation, or in areas affected thereby, such inauguration shall be subject to the approval of the competent military authorities.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 11, 1945, p. 198.

*Article IV*

In order to prevent discriminatory practices and to ensure equality of treatment, the Governments agree that:

(a) Each of them may impose or permit to be imposed on airlines of the other state just and reasonable charges for the use of public airports and other facilities on its territory provided that these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services;

(b) Fuel and oil, aircraft stores, spare parts and equipment introduced into the territory of one state by the other state or by nationals of the other state, and intended solely for use by aircraft of such other state shall be accorded national and most-favoured-nation treatment with respect to the imposition of customs and excise duties and taxes, inspection fees or other national duties or charges by the state whose territory is entered: provided, however, that such state may require that such imported materials shall be kept under customs supervision and control;

(c) The fuel and oil, aircraft stores, spare parts and equipment retained on board civil aircraft of the airlines authorized to operate the routes and services described in the Annex shall, upon arriving in or leaving the territory of the other state, be exempt from the imposition of customs and excise duties and taxes, inspection fees or other national duties or charges, even though such supplies be used or consumed by such aircraft on flights in that territory;

(d) Neither of them will give a preference to its own airlines against the airlines of the other state in the application of its customs, immigration, quarantine and similar regulations or in the use of airports, airways or other facilities.

*Article V*

The laws and regulations of each state relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of the other state, and shall be complied with by such aircraft, upon entering or de-

parting from or while within the territory of that state.

*Article VI*

Each Government reserves the right to withhold or revoke a certificate or permit to an airline of the other state in any case where it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control are vested in nationals of that state, or in case of failure of an airline to comply with the laws of the state over which it operates, as described in Article V, or to perform its obligations under this Agreement.

*Article VII*

This Agreement shall apply to the territory of the continental United States including Alaska, and to the territory of Canada including the territorial waters adjacent to each territory.

*Article VIII*

The aircraft operated by United States airlines shall conform at all times with the airworthiness requirements prescribed by the competent aeronautical authorities of the United States of America for aircraft employed in air transportation of the character contemplated by this Agreement.

The aircraft operated by Canadian airlines shall conform at all times with the airworthiness requirements prescribed by the competent aeronautical authorities of Canada for aircraft employed in air transportation of the character contemplated by this Agreement.

*Article IX*

The competent authorities of the two Governments shall enter into agreements concerning the transportation of mail on the services authorized by this Agreement.

*Article X*

The services authorized by this Agreement and for which rights are specified in the Annex shall be conducted in accordance with the following provisions:

(1) Pending the coming into force of the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on December 7, 1944, they shall

be subject to the applicable terms of the Air Navigation Agreement between Canada and the United States of America effected by an exchange of notes of July 28, 1938;

(2) Additional stops may be made in the territory of the state of which an airline is a national at the election of that state, provided that these stops lie in reasonable proximity to the direct route connecting the terminals indicated in the Annex, and subject to the special provisions indicated therein with respect to particular routes;

(3) Holders of through tickets travelling on a through international service may make stopovers at any point where a landing is made even though such landing is made at a point not otherwise authorized for the pick-up and discharge of traffic;

(4) Future proposals for services between any point in Alaska and any point in Canada west of the 130th meridian shall be initially considered (unless in any particular case the two Governments shall agree to follow a different course) by a representative designated by each Government whose recommendations shall be transmitted to the two Governments for action;

(5) The routes specified in the Annex shall be open for operation by properly designated airlines at any time during the life of the Agreement. The rights shall not lapse with any failure to exercise them, or any interruption of such exercise.

### Article XI

This Agreement supersedes that relating to air transport services effected by an exchange of notes of August 18, 1939, the supplementary arrangement relating to air transport services effected by an exchange of notes of November 29 and December 2, 1940 and the exchange of notes of March 4, 1943, which continued in force the supplementary arrangement of November 29 and December 2, 1940.

### Article XII

The Annex to this Agreement shall be reviewed from time to time by the competent aeronautical authorities of the two Governments. These authorities may recommend to their respective Governments modifications of the Annex. Such modifications, if approved by both Governments, shall be made effective by exchange of notes.

### Article XIII

This Agreement and all contracts connected therewith shall be registered with the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization.

### Article XIV

This Agreement shall become effective on February 19, 1945, and shall remain in effect until terminated by mutual agreement or until twelve months after the giving of notice by either Government to the other Government.

### ANNEX

A. The airlines designated by the Government of the United States of America may operate on the following routes, with the right to take on and put down passengers, mail and cargo at the Canadian terminals specified:

Boston	-	Moncton
Boston	-	Montreal
New York or	-	Quebec
Boston		
New York	- {	Montreal
		Ottawa

(Provided that Montreal and Ottawa shall not be served on the same flight)

Washington	- {	Montreal
		Ottawa

(Provided that Montreal and Ottawa shall not be served on the same flight, and that the last point touched in the United States, if it be other than Washington, shall lie east of the 77th meridian)

Buffalo	-	Toronto
Fargo	-	Winnipeg
Great Falls	-	Lethbridge
Seattle	-	Vancouver
Seattle	-	Whitehorse
Fairbanks	-	Whitehorse.

The service on the route between Buffalo and Toronto may, at the election of the United States Government, be rendered by two airlines. On the other routes service by a single airline only will be authorized.

In addition to the routes listed above, airlines of United States registry will be authorized to stop in Windsor on any route on which they are now or in the future may be authorized by the United States Government to serve Detroit.

B. The airlines designated by the Government of Canada may operate on the following routes, with the right to take on and put down passengers,

mail and cargo at the United States terminals specified:

Halifax	-	Boston
Toronto	-	New York
Toronto	-	Cleveland
Toronto	-	Chicago (No stop will

be made on this route at any Canadian point within forty miles of Detroit.)

Port Arthur	-	Duluth
Victoria	-	Seattle
Whitehorse	-	Fairbanks.

A single airline will be authorized for each of the foregoing routes. With respect to the routes between Toronto and Cleveland and Toronto and Chicago no through services will be operated from either point in the United States to points lying beyond the territorial limits of Canada.

In addition to the routes listed above, airlines of Canadian registry will be authorized to stop in Detroit on any route on which they are now or in the future may be authorized by the Canadian Government to serve Windsor.

If these proposals are acceptable to the Government of the United States of America, this note, and your reply thereto accepting the proposals, shall be regarded as placing on record the understanding arrived at between the two Governments concerning this matter.

Accept [etc.]

L. B. PEARSON

The Honourable JOSEPH C. GREW,  
*Acting Secretary of State of the United States,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

FEBRUARY 17, 1945

EXCELLENCY:

I have the honor to acknowledge your note No. 46 of February 17, 1945, in which you propose that an agreement be entered into between the Governments of the United States of America and Canada relating to civil air transport.

The agreement as proposed in your note is acceptable to the Government of the United States of America. Your note and this reply are regarded as placing on record the understanding arrived at between the two Governments.

Accept [etc.]

For the Acting Secretary of State:

W. L. CLAYTON

His Excellency

L. B. PEARSON, O.B.E.,  
*Ambassador of Canada.*

## Sanitary Conventions of 1944

### United Kingdom

The British Ambassador informed the Acting Secretary of State by a note dated February 21 of the application to certain territories of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, and the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944. These two sanitary conventions were opened for signature at Washington December 15, 1944 and came into force January 15, 1945.

According to the Ambassador's note, the provisions of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, now apply to the following British territories:

Newfoundland	Kenya (Colony and Protec-
British Solomon Islands	torate)
Protectorate	Nigeria
Ceylon	(a) Colony
Cyprus	(b) Protectorate
Falkland Islands and De-	(c) Cameroons under
pendencies	British Mandate
Fiji	Northern Rhodesia
Gambia (Colony and Pro-	Nyasaland Protectorate
tectorate)	Palestine
Gibraltar	Sierra Leone (Colony and
Gilbert and Ellice Islands	Protectorate)
Colony	St. Helena and Dependen-
Gold Coast	cies
(a) Colony	Tanganyika Territory
(b) Ashanti	Trans-Jordan
(c) Northern Territories	Uganda Protectorate
(d) Togoland under Brit-	Zanzibar Protectorate
ish Mandate	

The provisions of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, now apply to the following British territories:

Newfoundland	Mauritius
Southern Rhodesia	Nigeria
British Solomon Islands	(a) Colony
Protectorate	(b) Protectorate
Cyprus	(c) Cameroons under
Falkland Islands and De-	British Mandate
pendencies	Northern Rhodesia
Fiji	Palestine
Gilbert and Ellice Islands	Sierra Leone (Colony and
Colony	Protectorate)
Gold Coast	Trans-Jordan
(a) Colony	Uganda Protectorate
(b) Ashanti	Zanzibar Protectorate
(c) Northern Territories	High Commission terri-
(d) Togoland under Brit-	ties
ish Mandate	Basutoland
Kenya (Colony and Protec-	Bechuanaland
torate)	Swaziland

Lord Halifax signed each convention with the reservation that his signature did not cover any of the territories referred to in article 24 of the sanitary convention and article 21 of the sanitary convention for aerial navigation. The two articles provide in identical words that any contracting party may on signature or accession declare that the convention does not apply to all or any of its colonies, overseas territories, territories under its protection, suzerainty, or authority, or territories in respect of which it exercises a mandate, but that the convention may at any time thereafter be applied to any such territory by notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America.

## Agreement Between the United States and Canada Regarding Military Air-Transport Routes

[Released to the press February 19]

A wartime agreement has been reached with Canada regarding military air-transport routes operated by one country over the territory of the other. The agreement replaces a number of special arrangements dealing with particular routes and, for the most part, provides for a continuation of the practices which the two Governments have adopted to aid the prosecution of the war by granting all necessary facilities to transport aircraft operated by or on behalf of the armed forces of the United States and Canada.

These aircraft of either country may use all airway facilities in the other country along the routes which they are now flying. Considerations of military security prevent the publication of these routes at the present. The agreement provides that civil airlines operating under contract with the armed forces shall display no identifying markings advertising the name of a commercial airline.

No traffic originating in or destined to points in Canada will be carried for reward or hire on aircraft operated by or on behalf of the armed forces of the United States, though they are permitted to carry revenue traffic through Canada if it originates in and is destined to points outside Canada.

The agreement is for the duration of the war, subject to termination at any time on six months'

notice by either Government. All rights acquired by either Government terminate at the end of the war.

## Signing of Military-Aviation-Mission Agreement With Guatemala

[Released to the press February 21]

In conformity with the request of the Government of Guatemala there was signed on Wednesday, February 21, 1945, at 4 p.m., by the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, and His Excellency Señor Don Eugenio Silva Peña, Ambassador of Guatemala in Washington, an agreement providing for the detail of a military-aviation mission by the United States to serve in Guatemala.

The agreement will continue in force for four years from the date of signature but may be extended beyond that period at the request of the Government of Guatemala.

The agreement contains provisions similar in general to provisions contained in agreements between the United States and certain other American republics providing for the detail of officers of the United States Army or Navy to advise the armed forces of those countries.

## Bombings of Swiss Towns

*Statement by ACTING SECRETARY CREW*

[Released to the press February 24]

I was profoundly shocked and distressed when the Swiss Minister in Washington notified me of a series of bombings and strafings of Swiss towns on February 22 by United States aircraft which resulted in the death of 16 persons and the injury of many more. A full investigation has been undertaken by our military authorities to determine our responsibility for this tragic occurrence. Whatever the nationality of the planes, I wish to express my sympathy to the families of the victims. Should it be established that United States planes were responsible for this tragic accident, an official expression of our deep regret, and of our desire to make reparation in so far as that is humanly possible, will be made to the Swiss Government.

# Coordination of CITEJA With the New International Civil-Aviation Organizations

By STEPHEN LATCHFORD<sup>1</sup>

THE DELEGATES to the International Civil Aviation Conference which met at Chicago on November 1, 1944 adopted a resolution concerning CITEJA<sup>2</sup> in which it was recommended that the various governments give consideration to the desirability of coordinating the activities of CITEJA with the international civil-aviation organizations for which provision was made at Chicago. It seems to be appropriate, therefore, to give consideration to the manner in which such coordination might best be effected.

It will be recalled that the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization is to function under the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation adopted at Chicago when that agreement comes into force, and that the permanent International Civil Aviation Organization

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Latchford is Adviser on Air Law, Aviation Division, Office of Transportation and Communications, Department of State; Chairman of the United States Section of CITEJA. He was an adviser to the United States Delegation to the recent International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago.

<sup>2</sup> The initials of the French name of the organization, Comité International Technique d'Experts Juridiques Aériens, translated in the United States as the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts. The organization of this Committee, on which, as of March 1939, 27 countries including the United States were represented, was recommended by the delegates to the First International Conference on Private Air Law held at Paris in 1925. The Committee has been engaged in the preparation of projects of international conventions on various subjects of private international air law for final adoption and signature at periodic international conferences, three having been held since the 1925 conference. A convention relating to the liability of the air carrier in international transportation was adopted provisionally by the 1925 conference. The 1925 draft was revised by CITEJA and adopted in final form at an international conference at Warsaw in 1929. Conventions adopted at subsequent international conferences on private air law have dealt with such subjects as damages to persons and property on the surface caused by aircraft in flight, assistance and salvage of aircraft at sea, aviation insurance, and the conditions under which aircraft employed in international services might be exempted from attachment for debt. For a description of the Committee's activities and a résumé of its work see BULLETIN of Jan. 7, 1945, p. 11.

will function under the permanent Convention on International Civil Aviation adopted at Chicago when that convention comes into force.

The convention will, according to its terms, ultimately supersede the International Convention for the Regulation of Aerial Navigation signed at Paris on October 13, 1919. That convention established the International Commission for Air Navigation, frequently referred to as the CINA, the initials of the French name of the organization, which is clothed with a number of executive and administrative functions, including the power to develop technical international aeronautical regulations, embodied in annexes to the Paris convention. The International Civil Aviation Organization which is to function under the Chicago convention will have, among its powers and duties, a number which are broadly analogous to those exercised by the CINA. It is pertinent, therefore, to give a brief historical review of the discussions which took place in the past as to the extent to which the activities of CITEJA could be coordinated with those of the CINA.

The question whether the CINA, which dealt with public international air law, had jurisdiction to deal with private international air law arose in 1923, when the French Government had under consideration the calling of the First International Conference on Private Air Law. In that connection the French Government addressed a communication to the Secretary General of the CINA stating that, although the matters to be submitted to the then proposed international conference on private air law did not come within the scope of the work of the CINA, they were capable of giving rise to problems relating to the regulation of air navigation dealt with by that organization. The French Government suggested that the CINA be associated in the work of the proposed private-air-law conference and requested that the Secretary General of the CINA be authorized to organize and conduct the secretariat of the conference. The CINA unanimously adopted a resolution<sup>3</sup> direct-

<sup>3</sup> Resolution No. 130, Official Bulletin No. 5 of the International Commission for Air Navigation (1923), p. 29.

ing its Secretary General to undertake the work of the secretariat of the conference which the French Government proposed to call, and in the same resolution directed the Secretary General to point out to the French Government that paragraph (g) of article 34 of the 1919 convention expressly provided that CINA would have jurisdiction in regard to all "questions which the States may submit for examination." The CINA resolution indicated that it considered that the question of the liability of aerial carriers, which the French Government at that time was considering as the subject of the then proposed private-air-law conference, was closely allied in practice to questions pertaining to the regulation of aerial navigation, the study of which the CINA claimed devolved upon it under the terms of the 1919 convention, and that the CINA deemed itself fully qualified by means of its legal subcommission usefully to study the subject of the liability of air carriers. In conclusion the CINA resolution recommended that, in order to maintain a unity of views in the organization of air navigation and air traffic, paragraph (g) of article 34 of the 1919 convention be interpreted in its broadest sense by the contracting states.

The acquiescence of the CINA in the calling of an international conference on private air law by the French Government was explained by Albert Roper, Secretary General of the CINA, in a statement the substance of which was as follows:

"The French Government had in fact thought of asking the International Commission for Air Navigation to undertake these studies, but at that time only twenty-one countries were parties to the 1919 Convention. Therefore, only these countries were entitled to representation on the Commission. Under these circumstances the French Government decided to call a general international conference on private air law for the study of the liability of air carriers, an important question of universal interest.

"There was on that occasion no conflict between the French Government and the CINA. The former stated its intentions to the CINA and offered to associate the CINA in the work contemplated, by requesting it to authorize its Secretary General to take charge of the secretariat of the private air law conference.

"The CINA on its part, while maintaining that

it had jurisdiction in the matter, appreciated the reasons which influenced the French Government in calling the private-air-law conference and made no protest, but willingly authorized the cooperation suggested by that Government. In that connection, the CINA considered that the eventual broadening of the scope of the Convention of 1919 would do away with the 'temporary duplication of a question the two parts of which are manifestly connected'." \*

Apparently after the discussion of 1923 the CINA not only did not make an issue of CITEJA's activities, but as a matter of fact the Secretary General of the CINA attended CITEJA sessions on various occasions as an observer on behalf of the CINA. In that connection he was always willing to make any comments deemed to be helpful in the current CITEJA discussions. Conversely, the Secretary General of CITEJA kept in close touch with the activities of the CINA and other international bodies whose deliberations were of interest to CITEJA.

It would seem that had the CINA undertaken an extensive development of private air law as CITEJA has done the CINA would not have had the time to develop technical regulations within the field of public international air law to the extent that it has done so, unless perhaps it had decided upon a different plan of organization. The CINA appears to have been almost continuously employed through its various subcommissions in the development of numerous technical regulations within the field of public air law under the convention of 1919.

The question of merging the organization of CITEJA with the CINA was raised in a lengthy critical review of the convention of 1919 written by Dr. Alfred Wegerdt, Ministerial-rat of the Reich Ministry of Communications.<sup>5</sup> This article

\* See Albert Roper, "Note on the origin of the Air Convention of 13th October 1919, its progressive extension from 1922 to 1928, and the problem of its revision", accompanying the Minutes of the Extraordinary Session of the CINA, Paris, June 1929, *Documents of Session*, p. 12. NOTE: There was no broadening of the scope of the 1919 convention that changed the situation with respect to the procedure for the development of private international air law.

<sup>5</sup> "Germany and the Paris Convention relating to air navigation dated 13th October 1919", *Zeitschrift für das Gesamte Luftrecht*, vol. II, no. 1 (1928), p. 25; also *Documents of Session*, above cited, p. 37.

is understood to have been an important factor in the decision to hold the extraordinary session of CINA in 1929 to consider a number of amendments to the 1919 convention. Dr. Wegerdt stated in his article that while the organization and activities of CITEJA were fundamentally different from those of the CINA, this fact would not be changed in any way in case of incorporation of CITEJA into the CINA. He continued with the following observation:

"... Simply, for purposes of rationalisation such an incorporation seems worthy of consideration, as in many cases the representatives on the C.I.N.A. are the same as those on the C.I.T.E.J.A. and probably the only reason why the C.I.N.A. was not in the first place entrusted with the task of the C.I.T.E.J.A. was that only a limited number of States belong to the former, barely half of those which accepted the French Government's invitation to take part in the international private air law Conference in October 1925."<sup>6</sup>

It is rather interesting to observe that in 1932 Edmond Sudre, Secretary General of CITEJA, published an article dealing with the possible creation of an international air bureau.<sup>7</sup> He suggested that such an air bureau be divided into three sections. The first would be a technical section charged with making general technical studies and regulations on various subjects related to international air navigation. The second would be an air-traffic section concerned with all questions incident to commercial traffic and everything relating to the transportation of passengers and goods, including routes, airmail, unification and standardization of rates and schedules, and establishment of joint routes. The third would be a legal section concerned with questions of public and private air law. The third section, constituting a centralizing medium of information and study, would prepare a series of drafts of conventions for submission to periodic international conferences and would in this manner carry on the unification and codifica-

<sup>6</sup> In the instructions from the Secretary of State to the United States Delegates to the extraordinary session of the CINA in 1929, it was stated that the Government of the United States saw no objection in principle to Dr. Wegerdt's suggested incorporation of CITEJA into the CINA. See *Foreign Relations*, 1929, vol. I, p. 505.

<sup>7</sup> "De l'organisation internationale de l'aviation civile", *Revue Générale de Droit Aérien*, vol. I, no. 1 (1932), p. 5.

tion of both public and private international air law. Mr. Sudre expressed the view that CITEJA might be the nucleus of the third section and that it would be advisable from the beginning to give to the legal section powers of consultation and interpretation of international-air-law texts. He thought that it might also be provided in a basic convention establishing an air bureau that, in case of conflicts of laws and differences of opinion, the interested states would have the right to choose the legal section as arbiter. In addition to the duties enumerated above the legal section would review proposals and drafts of conventions elaborated by the other sections of the International Air Bureau and prepare necessary texts. It is of interest in this connection to recall that in CITEJA meetings the United States members were opposed to having CITEJA exercise the power to interpret private-air-law conventions on the ground that an international organization such as CITEJA, having only the power to prepare preliminary texts of international conventions, should not undertake the duty of interpreting such conventions when they come into force, this being a function pertaining to the courts of the various countries.

#### CONCLUSIONS

As explained in this article the draft conventions on subjects of private air law are, after their adoption by CITEJA at its plenary sessions, submitted to periodic international conferences on private air law (diplomatic conferences) for final adoption and signature, with such modifications as the conferences may agree upon. This procedure renders it necessary to wait for some government to become sufficiently interested to issue invitations to the various governments to attend a private-air-law conference to take action on such CITEJA projects as might be referred to it. Experience has shown that there has been considerable delay in the calling of an international conference on private air law, the first of such conferences having been held in 1925, the second in 1929, the third in 1933, and the fourth in 1938.

It is believed that a workable plan of coordinating the work of CITEJA with the provisional and permanent international civil-aviation organizations as referred to in the resolution concerning CITEJA adopted at Chicago would be for the drafts adopted by CITEJA to be acted upon by

the Council and the Assembly of these Organizations in the following manner:

The Council could appoint a special committee to review CITEJA drafts and report thereon to the Council, which in turn would submit the drafts with its recommendations to the Assembly for final adoption and signature in the form of international conventions, or for such other action as the Assembly may wish to take. Twenty-one countries are to be represented on the Council. However, all the countries of the world members of the International Civil Aviation Organization would have an opportunity through their representatives in the Assembly to take final action on CITEJA drafts. It is assumed that there would be no difficulty in having such representatives obtain appropriate authorizations from their governments to sign conventions based on CITEJA drafts.

The Assembly on its initiative or upon recommendation of the Council could request CITEJA to undertake the study and preparation of private-air-law projects in much the same way as the international conferences on private air law have done.

Aside from the opportunity which the procedure suggested above would offer for close coordination of the activities of CITEJA with those of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the plan would obviate the necessity of waiting for some government to become sufficiently interested to call a conference on private air law, as well as the time and expense involved in attending and participating in such conferences. The Assembly of the Organization referred to is to meet annually and extraordinary meetings may be held at any time upon the call of the Council or at the request of ten contracting states. However, it is believed that action by the Assembly on the CITEJA drafts could be taken at a regular annual meeting without necessarily having a special meeting for the purpose.

The procedure outlined above would perhaps be the best to follow as a beginning, but as a long-range program it would seem that serious consideration might well be given to having the Council establish a permanent committee for the purpose of studying and making recommendations in the fields of both public and private air law. Such a committee would obviate the necessity of continuing CITEJA as a separate organization. This

plan would appear to be substantially the same as the one suggested by the Secretary General of CITEJA when he published the article discussing the possibilities of establishing an international air bureau. There is much to be said for developing public and private air law within the framework of a single and continuing organization, in view of the important relations of the problems arising out of private air law with those involved in the development of public air law.

---

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE—*Cont. from p. 281*

Victory in this war will not of itself resolve the difficulty or banish the danger. The months and years immediately ahead will see the supreme test of the faith that has always animated the American peoples and of the abilities and energies that have built the American nations.

I cannot escape the feeling that these are the times for which all that has gone into the making of the history of the Americas up to now was but the preparation.

The beliefs that have united the American peoples with each other can now unite them with the other freedom-loving peoples of the world. The unfinished pattern of the American purpose can now be completed in the larger fabric of a world purpose.

To this task and to this opportunity I ask the representatives of the nations represented here to join in dedicating ourselves.

I am reminded of the words of Abraham Lincoln to the Congress of the United States at a critical moment in the history of my country. They are words which might well be engraved in the hearts of all of us at this hour. He said:

“Fellow Citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. . . . We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility.”

That is what Abraham Lincoln said.

If we succeed—and as Americans who pioneered two virgin continents and founded here a new civilization, we know that *all* is possible—if we succeed, future generations will look back upon this

conference in Mexico City, and the conference in the Crimea, and the United Nations conference in San Francisco as among the great historic milestones on the road to a lasting peace and a new world of security and opportunity for all mankind.

## Economist Accepts Visiting Professorship to Paraguay

[Released to the press February 19]

Walter H. Delaplane, economist and educator, has been appointed visiting professor of economics and international trade at the National University of Paraguay at Asunción. Dr. Delaplane is one of a group of professors and technical experts who have received travel grants from the Department of State for service in other American republics. He expects to arrive at his post in Paraguay before March 1.

Dr. Delaplane, a resident of Durham, North Carolina, is a graduate of Oberlin College. He did postgraduate work at Duke University and carried on research, in Spain, for his doctoral thesis on the Spanish monetary system, and, in Colombia, on the monetary and exchange-control systems. He began teaching economics at Duke University in 1934 and from 1937-43 was also assistant to the dean of the Graduate School. In 1943 Dr. Delaplane came to Washington for service as economic analyst and later as Acting Chief of the Iberian Section of FEA.

## Relocation of Prisoner-of-War Camps in Germany

[Released to the press February 23]

The War Department and the Department of State, supplementing the information they received February 13, 1945, concerning the evacuation westward of American prisoners of war from camps in eastern Germany,<sup>1</sup> jointly announce it has now been confirmed that more than 1,000 Americans from Oflag 64 and Stalag III B have arrived at Stalag III A at Luckenwalde.

Other Americans from Oflag 64 and a large number of American prisoners of war from Stalag

Luft IV are in the vicinity of Swinemünde. About one half of the Americans formerly detained at Stalag Luft III are en route to Moosburg, while the destination of the other half is reported to be Nürnberg. A small number of American officers from Stalag Luft III were moved to Stalag III A at Luckenwalde.

Pending notification to the contrary, relatives and friends are urged to continue to address mail to individual prisoners of war to their last known addresses.

## Health and Sanitation

### Ecuador

An exchange of notes between the American Ambassador at Quito and the Ecuadoran Minister for Foreign Affairs, dated December 23, 1944 and January 15, 1945, provides for a contribution of an additional sum of \$200,000 by the Government of the United States of America, through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for a contribution of an equal amount by the Government of Ecuador, for the purpose of continuing the health and sanitation program initiated by the two Governments pursuant to an exchange of notes signed at Washington February 24, 1942.<sup>2</sup>

The recent exchange of notes provides that the extension of the program will terminate December 31, 1947 so far as the funds contributed by the United States are concerned.

The terms and conditions of the extension, as well as the specifications of the work to be performed, are to be agreed upon between the Ecuadoran Minister of Social Welfare and Labor and the official who will be designated for this purpose by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

## Chilean-Swiss Financial Agreement

The Swiss Federal Council ratified on January 4, 1945 the agreement between Chile and Switzerland, dated December 21, 1944, whereby Chilean and Swiss commercial claims are payable from January 1, 1945 in dollars of the United States of America, the American Legation at Bern reported by a telegram of January 10.

The present agreement is valid until further notice but may be denounced at any time with two months' previous notice. During the validity of

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 18, 1945, p. 237.

<sup>2</sup> Executive Agreement Series 379.

this agreement, the application of the Chilean-Swiss clearing and compensation agreement of May 29, 1934 is suspended, but on the expiration of the present agreement the 1934 agreement is to be applied again automatically.

## Visit of Bolivian Educator

[Released to the press February 19]

Dr. Héctor Ormachea Zalles, rector of the University of San Andrés at La Paz, Bolivia, is guest of the Department of State on a three-month tour of colleges and universities in this country. He is especially interested in observing curricula and methods in the teaching of economics and finance.

Dr. Ormachea Zalles was Minister of Finance of Bolivia before assuming the rectorship of the University of San Andrés, which draws students from all sections of the country but corresponds to one of our State universities. Present enrolment is about 1,250, including 100 women students. Most of the latter are enrolled in the School of Biochemistry. The University of San Andrés is autonomous, the rector being elected by a two-thirds vote of students and faculty. Dr. Ormachea Zalles has twice been re-elected to the post. When he first assumed the rectorship in 1935, at the age of 33, he was the youngest university head in South America.

In December of this year the University of San Andrés, which was founded in 1832, will move into and occupy a new 18-story building—the tallest building in the Bolivian capital. Dr. Ormachea Zalles, while in the Ministry of Finance, established a university chair on mathematical theory of investments, which he taught while a member of the Cabinet and has continued to teach as rector. Deeply interested in inter-American cultural co-operation, he is chairman of the Scholarship Selection Committee for Bolivia and president of the board of directors of the American Institute of that country.

## THE FOREIGN SERVICE

### Confirmations

On February 19, 1945 the Senate confirmed the nominations of Wallace Murray as American Ambassador to Iran and Felix Cole as American Minister to Ethiopia.

## Consular Offices

The American Consulate at Le Havre, France, was reestablished on February 16, 1945.

**FOSDICK**—Continued from page 298

### VI

We must realize, however, that all this cultural interchange and the creation of common understanding and knowledge among peoples will not alone guarantee the peace. While we recognize the tremendous promise of the efforts to extend this understanding, we must remind ourselves that sustained and devoted activity depends upon more than understanding. A faith and a spirit is required in building the peace comparable to that of the medieval townsfolk in building their great cathedrals.

The townsfolk viewed the building of the cathedral as a community enterprise. Everyone contributed according to his talents and ability. They did not leave the work to the town council; they themselves shouldered responsibility for it. They recognized that the cathedral would rise only as high as they together would build.

The medieval townsfolk did not expect to see the cathedral completed within their own lifetime. They knew the task would take centuries to accomplish. When progress was slow, they were undiscouraged. They kept patiently and steadfastly on, knowing that for the sake of the generations to come they could not afford to be discouraged.

The townsfolk were content to pick up the job where their fathers had left off—they did not try to build the spires before they had laid the foundations. They dreamed about the spires but they worked on the foundations, until they were strong. They labored where they could accomplish tangible results.

The medieval townsfolk did not wait for the completion of the cathedral before they began to use it. They knelt at unfinished altars and worshipped in chapels without roofs. They accepted temporary altars and make-shift roofs until the more perfect work could be completed. They made the most out of the work that was already done.

If in that spirit we approach the building of the peace, this may yet become the century in which are laid the firm foundations of peace.

## THE DEPARTMENT

## Appointment of Officers

## Alger Hiss

[Released to the press February 19]

Acting Secretary of State Grew announced on February 19 that Alger Hiss, now Deputy Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs in the Department of State, would succeed Edwin C. Wilson as Director of that Office when the latter leaves in the near future for his post as United States Ambassador in Turkey.

The Office of Special Political Affairs, under the general direction of the Special Assistant to the Secretary, Leo Pasvolsky, has responsibility in the Department for all matters concerning the proposed United Nations Organization.

Mr. Hiss, who accompanied the President and the Secretary of State to the recent meeting at Yalta in the Crimea, has been with the Department since September 1, 1936. He served until the summer of 1939 as assistant to Francis B. Sayre, then Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the reciprocal trade-agreements program, and subsequently as assistant to Stanley K. Hornbeck when the latter was Adviser on Political Relations and Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs.

Mr. Hiss has been with the Office of Special Political Affairs since May 1944 and became Deputy Director of the Office in November 1944. He was educated at Johns Hopkins University and Harvard University Law School.

## Adlai E. Stevenson

[Released to the press February 23]

Acting Secretary of State Grew announces the appointment of Adlai E. Stevenson of Chicago as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State. Mr. Stevenson will work with Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish in matters relating to post-war international organization.

Mr. Stevenson was Special Assistant and Legal Adviser to the late Frank Knox while he was Secretary of the Navy and has also performed various foreign assignments for the Government.

## Benjamin Gerig

Benjamin Gerig has been appointed Associate Chief of the Division of International Organiza-

tion Affairs, concurrently with his duties as Chief of the Division of Dependent Area Affairs, effective February 1, 1945.

## PUBLICATIONS

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Diplomatic List, February 1945. Publication 2260. II, 123 pp. Subscription, \$2 a year; single copy, 20¢.

Military Service: Agreement Between the United States of America and China—Effectuated by exchanges of notes signed at Washington November 6, 1943 and May 11 and June 13, 1944. Executive Agreement Series 426. Publication 2262. 6 pp. 5¢.

Health and Sanitation Program: Agreement Between the United States of America and Panama—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Panamá December 31, 1942 and March 2, 1943. Executive Agreement Series 428. Publication 2261. 6 pp. 5¢.

Health and Sanitation Program: Agreement Between the United States of America and Paraguay—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Washington May 18 and 22, 1942. Executive Agreement Series 436. Publication 2264. 5 pp. 10¢.

## FOREIGN COMMERCE WEEKLY

The article listed below will be found in the February 24 issue of the Department of Commerce publication entitled *Foreign Commerce Weekly*, copies of which may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for 10 cents each:

"North European Pulp and Paper Industries: Current Supply Conditions," based on a report by Grant Olson, attaché, American Legation, Stockholm.

## THE CONGRESS

Enactment of Title 17 of the United States Code Into Positive Law. H. Rept. 151, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 2199. 39 pp.

Amending Section 327 (H) of the Nationality Act of 1940. H. Rept. 159, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 392. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Preserving the Residence for Naturalization Purposes of Certain Aliens Who Serve in the Military or Naval Forces of One of the Allied Countries During the Second World War, or Otherwise Assist in the Allied War Effort. H. Rept. 160, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 513. 5 pp. [Favorable report.]

Providing for the Naturalization of Certain Alien Veterans of the World War. H. Rept. 161, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 578. 2 pp. [Favorable report.]

Amending the Nationality Act of 1940. H. Rept. 162, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 669. 4 pp. [Favorable report.]

Amending Section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 So As To Preserve the Nationality of Certain United States Citizens Who Have Been Unable To Return to the United States. H. Rept. 163, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 387. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Granting A Nonquota Status to Certain Alien Veterans and Their Wives. H. Rept. 164, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 433. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Amending the Nationality Act of 1940. H. Rept. 165, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 511. 4 pp. [Favorable report.]

Providing for the Reimbursement of Certain Civilian Personnel for Personal Property Lost as a Result of the Japanese Occupation of Hong Kong and Manila. H. Rept. 174, 79th Cong., to accompany H. R. 990. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Amending Section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, Waiving Certain Fees for Members of the Armed Forces. H. Rept. 184, 79th Cong., to accompany H.R. 391. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Amending the Law Relating to the Authority of Certain Employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service To Make Arrests Without Warrant in Certain Cases and To Search Vehicles Within Certain Areas. H. Rept. 186, 79th Cong., to accompany H. R. 386. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Repatriating Native-Born Women Residents of the United States. H. Rept. 189, 79th Cong., to accompany H. R. 384. 3 pp. [Favorable report.]

Reports To Be Made To Congress: Letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or Department to make to Congress. H. Doc. 17, 79th Cong. 31 pp.

The Budget of the United States Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1946. H. Doc. 27, 79th Cong. xxx, A89 pp., 851 pp. [Department of State, A17, A20, A60, A72, 581-600, 694-696.]

Supplemental Estimate of Appropriation for the Department of State: Communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of \$60,000, for the Department of State, for the fiscal year 1946, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year. H. Doc. 76, 79th Cong. 2 pp.

Supplemental Estimate of Appropriation for the Department of State: Communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of \$25,000, for the Department of State. H. Doc. 81, 79th Cong. 2 pp.

Eighteenth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations: Letter from the Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, transmitting Eighteenth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the period ended December 31, 1944. H. Doc. 98, 79th Cong. 76 pp.

## *Contents—Continued*

TREATY INFORMATION—Continued.

TREATY INFORMATION—Continued.		Page
Sanitary Conventions of 1944.	United Kingdom . . . . .	308
Health and Sanitation.	Ecuador . . . . .	314
Chilean-Swiss Financial Agreement . . . . .		314
<b>THE DEPARTMENT</b>		
Appointment of Officers . . . . .		316
<b>THE FOREIGN SERVICE</b>		
Confirmations . . . . .		315
Consular Offices . . . . .		315
<b>PUBLICATIONS</b> . . . . .		316
<b>THE CONGRESS</b> . . . . .		316